

Anglican Theological Review

GENERAL LIBRARY

ACT 26 1918
EDITED BY

SAMUEL A. B. MEREDITH & LESTER C. LEWIS

Professors in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

In Collaboration with Representative Scholars
throughout the Church



VOLUME I

OCTOBER, 1918

NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

The Educational Aspect of Confirmation	133
<i>Lester Bradner</i>	
The Development of Apostolic Christology	148
<i>Burton Scott Easton</i>	
Credal Formulation in the New Testament	164
<i>Theodore B. Foster</i>	
Christian Theology and Hindu Religious Thinking	184
<i>John A. Maynard</i>	
Another Problem of Evil	191
<i>Dickinson S. Miller</i>	
An Old Testament Bibliography for 1914 to 1917 Inclusive	214
<i>H. C. Ackerman</i>	
Critical Note	240
A Maronite Missal (<i>Robert F. Lau</i>)	
Reviews	248
Notes and Comments	259

PUBLISHED BY

Columbia University Press

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK

Anglican Theological Review

ADVISERS

VERY REV. WM. C. DEWITT, D.D., Dean of Western Theological Seminary

VERY REV. HUGHELL E. W. FOSBROKE, D.D., Dean of General Theological Seminary

REV. WILLIAM T. MANNING, D.D., D.C.L., Rector of Trinity Church, New York

REV. HARVEY OFFICER, Order of the Holy Cross

EDITORIAL BOARD

HONORARY COOPERATING EDITORS

REV. PROFESSOR LORING W. BATTEN, D.D., Ph.D., General Theological Seminary

REV. PROFESSOR F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D., Union Theological Seminary

REV. PROFESSOR FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D., General Theological Seminary

RT. REV. WILLIAM WALTER WEBB, D.D., Bishop of Milwaukee

REV. ELWOOD WORCESTER, D.D., Ph.D., Emmanuel Church, Boston

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

REV. LESTER BRADNER, Ph.D., General Board of Religious Education (Religious Education)

REV. PROFESSOR BURTON S. EASTON, D.D., Ph.D., Western Theological Seminary (New Testament)

REV. PROFESSOR ARTHUR P. HUNT, M.A., B.D., General Theological Seminary (Ethics)

REV. PROFESSOR LEICESTER C. LEWIS, M.A., B.D., Western Theological Seminary (Church History)

REV. PROFESSOR SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D., Western Theological Seminary (Old Testament)

REV. PROFESSOR DICKINSON S. MILLER, Ph.D., Sc.D., General Theological Seminary (Dogmatics and Apologetics)

ASSISTANT EDITORS

REV. PROFESSOR HOWARD C. ACKERMAN, M.A., B.D., Nashotah House (Old Testament)

REV. PROFESSOR THEODORE B. FOSTER, B.A., Western Theological Seminary (Dogmatics)

REV. FREDERICK C. GRANT, S.T.M., St. Luke's, Evanston (New Testament)

REV. EDWIN S. LANE, M.A., B.D., St. John's, Philadelphia (Apologetics)

REV. ROBERT F. LAU, D.D., St. John's, Bayonne (Liturgics)

REV. JOHN A. MAYNARD, D.D., Ph.D., Holy Trinity Church (St. James' Parish), New York (History of Religions)

PROFESSOR VIDA D. SCUDDER, M.A., Wellesley College (Ethics)

All editorial communications should be addressed to the editors at 2720 Washington Blvd., Chicago, Ill., U. S. A.

The REVIEW is published four times a year, in May, October, December, and March by the Columbia University Press, a corporation. The officers of the press are Nicholas Murray Butler, president; Wm. H. Carpenter, secretary; and John B. Pine, treasurer. Subscription price, \$4.00 annually. Single numbers, \$1.00. Subscriptions should be addressed to Columbia University Press, Columbia University, New York, N. Y., U. S. A., or to the editors.

Copyright, 1918, by Columbia University Press





Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER and LEICESTER C. LEWIS

Professors in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

In Collaboration with Representative Scholars
throughout the Church

VOLUME I

OCTOBER, 1918

NUMBER 2

THE EDUCATIONAL ASPECT OF CONFIRMATION

By LESTER BRADNER, General Board of
Religious Education, New York

Most of us are tempted to consider Confirmation chiefly from the ecclesiastical point of view. But there is another side, the educational. That is the side I wish to bring into view at present. The two are easily distinguished. As an example of the ecclesiastical side one may be interested to consult, as I was, the lucid and scholarly article in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, for the sake of getting the Roman Catholic point of view. Here one will find a treatment reflecting centuries of Church experience with Confirmation as an institution. Such an experience ought to afford valuable deductions as to the educational principles involved in Confirmation. We might be shown just how it affects the life of the Christian child; at what age it is best applied; what educational features should accompany its use. But there is no such information in store for us in this article. Possibly we should not have looked for it there. However, the whole ecclesiastical side is there: the history of the rite, its definition as a Sacrament, its relation to Holy Baptism, the regulations regarding its observance in the Roman Church.

Yet ever since Confirmation became separated by a space of years from Holy Baptism—a practice which did not arise until

some time in the thirteenth century—it has possessed a distinctly educational side, which is a legitimate subject for discussion, and should have considerable bearing on our usages in regard to the observance of the rite. Curiously enough, however, educational motives seem to have played no part at all in effecting the separation just mentioned. The reason for it was apparently purely an administrative one, namely, the impossibility or the inconvenience of the presence of the Bishop, the necessary agent of Confirmation, at all Baptisms throughout his Diocese, and the inadvisability of appointing the parish priest to act constantly as the Bishop's deputy in the function. This led in due time to the deferring of Confirmation until the child was six or seven years of age. One would like to know just how this particular age came to be selected as the most suitable, but the data are not at hand.

Indeed the proper age, or the most desirable age for the Confirmation of a child is perhaps the most important question which the educational aspect of the subject brings forward, and the main point which I wish to discuss here.

Although the age of six or seven, selected in the thirteenth century, remained for some time the usual age for Confirmation, the effect of the Reformation, outside the Church of Rome, was to make the interval very much longer, bringing the candidate forward somewhere between the ages of sixteen and twenty. Quite evidently this change was due to the feeling that some degree of intellectual maturity on the part of the candidate was necessary in order that he should assume carefully and thoughtfully the position of personal responsibility attached to Confirmation, and that his moral tendencies should be fairly well settled before he proceeded to this supreme choice. All this was in perfect accord with the increased appeal to the intellect and to personal judgment which the Reformation emphasized.

This, I believe, was the attitude preserved and handed down through the Church of England to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and which largely governed our

usages during the nineteenth century. I imagine that an examination of such parish records of that period as give the ages at Confirmation would show that the candidates were as a rule, or on the average, not much below sixteen years of age. In the last ten or fifteen years, however, one can sense a distinct change of opinion and practice in this matter. Without any accurate statistics for consultation, I incline to think that our *average* age of Confirmation is dropping to about fourteen. Instances are frequent where it is administered much earlier, even at ten and eleven.

This tendency to lower the age is often supported from what may be termed the sacramental point of view. It would be argued that Confirmation confers a blessing of spiritual assistance and direction, and moreover it is at present the necessary prelude to the privilege of the Holy Communion. Therefore it would be a mistake to withhold such spiritual advantages until most of the struggles incident to maturing life are over. In fact, from this point of view the earlier Confirmation may reasonably be had the better. The logic of this argument strictly applied might possibly lead us back to the practice of pre-Reformation days, and lower the Confirmation age to a point even below ten years.

The difference in attitude on this point is largely due to the estimate of what is accomplished from without in the individual being confirmed, through the efficacy of the Sacrament. Those who would emphasize the necessity of cooperation on the part of the individual, and especially his fitness to understand the moral and doctrinal positions to which he is giving personal assent and allegiance, and his capacity to assume the responsibility which must rest upon a self-directed membership in the Church, will naturally choose a later age. Those who emphasize more exclusively the Divine blessing conferred upon the individual by virtue of the Sacrament or rite will naturally seek whatever benefit there is in this at the earliest possible moment.

For my present purposes the discussion of whether or in how far Confirmation is a Sacrament makes no great difference. I

can here accept for Confirmation with equanimity the title of a 'lesser Sacrament'. My real concern is to point out that, granting that Confirmation is a Sacrament of some sort, there is yet a distinct advantage educationally in selecting the proper stage in the development of the individual at which to administer it, and a distinct disadvantage in its administration either earlier or later than the attainment of this stage.

For so long as the nature of man involves a correlated development of spirit and body, and an interdependence of some sort of the one upon the other, so that even our Lord Himself "advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor (or grace) with God and men," just so long will the spiritual effect of a Sacrament be heightened by a proper consideration of bodily conditions. We distinctly regard this principle in the case of the Holy Communion. We are not willing, as a matter of regularity, to administer it without regard to physical circumstances in the recipient. Emergencies may lead us to administer it at any hour of the day, say to the dying in the sick-room, or to the soldier going into battle. But if possible we prefer a reception in the early half of the day, and many would add the requirement of a fasting communion. Why should such restrictions be so universal in the face of the fact that this Sacrament was admittedly instituted at an evening meal, unless because we regard the freshness or preparedness of the body as an important factor? Equally much does our practice insist upon a certain mental condition in the recipient. We ask a *thoughtful* preparation for the Divine blessing as well as a physical preparation, in order that the blessing itself may be the greater. We seek a place apart, free from outside disturbances for our Celebration, and for the same reason. And if all these precautions as to concomitant conditions in the individual recipient are worthy to be exercised in the case of a Sacrament called greater and received frequently, are they not still more in place as supplemental to the effect of a Sacrament called lesser and exercised only once in a life-time?

I contend that the more we think about the sacramental principle in general, perceiving that it involves the same fundamental idea of *a corresponding fitness* between the outward sign and the grace signified, and the more we note how uniformly our current usages desire a suitable material and physical environment or basis for every Sacrament, the more we shall expect to learn and profit from the educational point of view as to the most suitable equation of condition in the individual for the administration of Sacraments in general, and of Confirmation in particular.

What then can we learn as to the most suitable equation in the development of the individual to form the physical, mental and emotional background for Confirmation? The science of psychology and human behavior, often called child-study, has in these last years thrown much light upon the answer to our question. It has contributed possibly as much to the effect of our Sacraments upon the individual as art and architecture have contributed to the effect of worship. Especially important is the observation and definition of what is going on inside the child between the ages of ten and eighteen, and the more accurate description of the phenomena of adolescence.

Adolescence, we have learned, is marked by three phases, usually called early, middle, and later adolescence. Later adolescence is chiefly an intellectual phase, and less unique in other ways than either of the other two. Of these two earlier periods the first is more prominently physical, and the second more peculiarly emotional. Yet neither is exclusively of the quality mentioned. The wider, firmer grasp of the intellect, the deeper emotion, and the rapid increase of physique are spread over both, in lesser degree.

What especially strikes the observer, as he watches the passage from later childhood into adolescence, is the sudden upward sweep of the social instincts. The boy who at eleven and a half is distinctly self-centered, disinclined to consider obligations moral and personal toward others, will often within a year begin a transformation which takes the discouraged

parent or teacher quite by surprise. It hardly seems possible for any factor of environment or of admonition to account for a change so rapid and so radical. It is something inward which has occurred, of which the subject himself is probably not conscious, and yet it is neither a miracle nor inexplicable. It is that marvelous change in the personal equation which is silently but surely brought about by budding adolescence. Social urgencies from without are no greater than before, but the capacity to understand and to respond to them has been wonderfully increased. And the difference is hailed by parent and teacher with a sigh of relief.

There is a similar striking increase in personal sensitiveness, manifesting itself in a hundred different ways. The boy or girl under twelve, if normal, is not very long or deeply concerned with inner personal questions or considerations. Therefore there is at this time little direct response to the mystical or strictly spiritual elements in religion, though there may be diligent compliance with its forms, and an excellent moral attitude. Sentiment plays a very minor part as a motive. The sense of the soul as a real entity, or of personality in relation to the hidden and the infinite has not yet developed. If introspection is present at all it is chiefly an abnormal factor. But the approach of adolescence reverses this equation also. The increase of power to apprehend inner relationship keeps step with the new race functions which develop in the body. Religion now makes a new appeal just because it is so full of inward ties and personal ideals or ambitions. What was before mostly a matter of form now sinks down into a relationship or an expression of spirits.

I would stop here to emphasize the fact that these predispositions to a deeper appreciation of religion are not predominantly intellectual in their origin at this early period. Apparently they are not the result of an increased store of *ideas* about religion. They belong far more to the realm of the instinctive and the emotional. They arise more from motives of a complex and social sort than from clearer theories about religious facts.

We recognize them as intuitions rather than as deductions, and for this very reason they possess a greater potency to effect real and rapid changes of character.

Resulting from the climax of the processes just described there emerges within the next two or three years, sooner with some and later with others, what the psychologists call a 'new self', that is, a new inward center of interest and mental activity, one which dominates also the outward activities and associations. This fresh center may be built up gradually and progressively, or in other cases it may come about with considerable struggle and even pain of mind. But, whether normally or abnormally, it arrives. It is the most real and vital thing about adolescence. It is just as much a new power of the inner self as the sex developments are new powers of the body. To fail to recognize and make use of it is a serious strategical error on the part of those who have the guidance of youth. Behind this new self there lies an invigorated power of the will. There is a driving force which even the early stages of adolescence have not exhibited. This driving power of the will now accentuates what we call individuality, steadiness of purpose, determination to accomplish—no matter what group opposition there may be to face. This is where life is hitched to an ideal, no matter whether it be high or low, and personal initiative makes itself really felt.

Those who have followed the writings of Starbuck, James, Coe and other psychologists will feel that my descriptions have been needlessly vague as regards the ages to be assigned to these phenomena. But I have purposely avoided the discussion of ages thus far because of the marked differences created by sex, by differing temperaments, and, in a lesser degree, by differing forms of training. There are, it is true, abundant statistics on religious awakening, and yet the bulk of them have happened to be taken out of those circles of Protestant Christianity where the idea of Christian nurture on a basis of infant Baptism does not prevail, and where intensive effort to kindle

a special religious fervor by revival methods has given a special type to religious experience.

The following principles may be considered fairly well established:

1. The phenomena of adolescence appear in girls at an earlier age than in boys, the difference being usually rather more than a year, and sometimes as much as two years.

2. There is a difference in the rapidity of attaining adolescence between the emotional, impulsive type of temperament and the more phlegmatic intellectual type. The latter is slower and more gradual in development.

3. In religious awakenings there are at least two broad types, labelled by Professor James as the 'healthy-minded', and the 'sin sick' souls. The attainment of the new self in the healthy-minded is gradual and easy, whereas for the other type it is hesitating and difficult, and therefore frequently sudden or delayed.

4. In general there are two periods in adolescence at which by far the greater number of religious awakenings occur. One is in the earliest stages and appears on the average between the ages of thirteen and fourteen, and the other later, at about sixteen.

There are certain conditions which predispose toward the *earlier* rise in religious interest. It is more common in girls than in boys, owing no doubt to the tendency toward earlier maturity. Intense and emotional natures also come forward earlier. Boys and girls who easily absorb and adopt surrounding attitudes or standards, and who find their way into higher ideals and generous practices without much struggle usually form another section in this earlier class.

By contrast the later awakening comes to more stubborn and self-willed natures, to individuals of slow maturity and phlegmatic temperament, to those whose religious nurture has been scanty or narrow, the neglected and poorly educated child, and to cases in which the environment has offered little religious

stimulus. All this appears to indicate that the energies collecting for the psychological moment at which the new self evolves are predominantly emotional in their nature, and therefore depend, as deeper emotions usually do, upon the later stages of bodily maturity.

I venture to think that with a systematic, well-applied effort at rounded Christian nurture on the part of the parish, backed by intelligent and devoted religious training in the home, at least two-thirds or three-quarters of our children would find an effective awakening to the Divine motives in life *during the earlier of the two periods*.

This working hypothesis of human development, then, is the basis for the cooperation we seek to establish in Confirmation between the Holy Spirit of God and the human child. We are dealing with the receptacle which is to receive the gift of Him who 'giveth to all men liberally'. This is what we know about the dimensions of the receptacle during youth.

Now let us ask to what instincts does Confirmation appeal when presented simply and biologically apart from technical ecclesiastical motives.

First, and probably strongest, is its *social* appeal both inward and outward. However much we may stress infant Baptism, the conscious sense of it as an experience can hardly compare in power for the adolescent with that moment when he, the individual, appears formally before the assembled Church, and is given recognition and admission to its holiest and highest ceremonies. We may reserve the term membership for Baptism, but to the adolescent Confirmation must, potentially at least, possess a similar significance. It is his *full* and *personal* identification with the visible organized congregation.

On the inner side, too, the emphasis in Confirmation lies in the establishment of a more intimate social relation with the Divine. The personal allegiance to Christ now formally announced, though recognized before perhaps, is in the contemplation of the ceremony greatly deepened as a social tie. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are tokens of a new intimacy. The

preparation for first Communion is full of a sense of closer relationship to God through Jesus Christ. The connection between the Divine life and the individual is drawn closer, and intimacy grows.

Secondly, Confirmation is a very *personal* experience. The preparation for it causes an exploration and measurement of one's own personality and inner motives. It creates a deeper personal tie between the soul and God. It awakens new appreciation of what the personal contribution of our own life and gifts to God may be. It stimulates and enlarges the inner powers of worship and personal devotion.

Thirdly, Confirmation appeals to the sense of *will power*, in connection with new energies. It speaks of strength, of purpose, and of service. It calls for an important act of volition in the direction of loyalty. It asks one to commit himself to a proposal involving a life decision and more. In many aspects it is one of the largest single choices which youth is called upon to make, calling together into one supreme act of will the results and consequences of hundreds of previous willings on behalf of what is noble and Divine.

We may, of course, choose to emphasize other things in presenting the idea of Confirmation to the adolescent. We may give an intellectual emphasis by stressing Christian Doctrine or Church Polity. But these points of view appear to me as less original or essential to Confirmation as such. It is not so much the ceremony of knowledge attained, as the conscious gift of strength to climb the stairway of heavenly wisdom. It is an initiatory rite of discipleship rather than a spiritual graduation exercise for a new apostle. Instead of conferring a diploma it introduces one to a Guide with whom he is to undertake the great adventure of faith. The full intellectual apprehension of the Church's position in thought and practice is surely not possible for any age short of the latest 'teens.

If my analysis of the significance of Confirmation is justified, then it appears that nothing could be so thoroughly in consonance with this universal adolescent process of the attain-

ment of a 'new self', which is acknowledged to contain as characteristic features, the social instinct, the new personal appreciation, and the awakening of a more mature and vital will power. There is the utmost reason that the two processes, spiritual and natural, should be kept in close company. The most assured results of educational study warn us to take advantage of the transformation which God Himself is accomplishing through the laws of growth in the development of the individual, and to use it as the human basis for the Divine enlargement which we seek.

This means, in the first place, that Confirmation later than sixteen years is apt to lose the advantage of the fresh impulses of youth, the feelings and the idealism which could have been given from the start a more religious moulding if an earlier point for Confirmation had been chosen. Beyond sixteen there is more to reconstruct, there is danger that slower progress will have been made beforehand than might have been the case. The new self has been more completely put together without the impetus and illumination of the Holy Spirit. After sixteen there probably are increased mentality and better ability to grasp and value abstract ideas, all of which might be to the good, were the chief desideratum for Confirmation a developed *concept* of Christian faith. But the spiritual experience of Confirmation must unquestionably be a colder affair and less creative after sixteen than before. And there is no good reason why the needful intellectual stimulus should not be given after Confirmation rather than before.

Yet more important is it that Confirmation should not (unless in very exceptional cases) be administered before the upward rise which stirs nearly every human being at about the age of twelve, or possibly a little later. To confirm earlier than this is to lose much of the effort we make because the capacity we need is not yet present. It is as if a man wishing to launch a boat should try to produce high tide by pouring water on the beach before the real tide comes in. His water is wasted. Let him have patience and the tide which God has made will come,

far better for his purposes than the puny flood he has tried to create. With the real flood-tide of adolescence we can accomplish far more than at other times. For then there is a natural hunger, as it were, for the thing which we have to offer. The effect of our effort goes deeper, and radiates further. The new social sense, the increased personal sensitiveness, the swelling affections, the dawn of ideals, a certain sense of the mystery of life, a better appreciation of the chivalry of self-giving, a more potent purpose for the future, all these natural concomitants of this period are on our side. We heighten, deepen, and broaden them by our attempt to apply them in religion and to vitalize them with a special grace of God.

Some will feel there is a danger in waiting. We may lose our hold upon a child now quite amenable. We may deprive him of something he ought to have. We imagine more danger than there really is. The characteristic of the junior age, so called, is its slow development as to the body and its rapid assimilation of dexterity and adjustments of all sorts. It is a period of appropriation and imitation as well as admiration. We need only pay some real attention to the junior, enter truly into some bit of his life to hold his allegiance, and keep his interests on our side. It is not from lack of religious ceremony, but from lack of genuine big-brotherliness that juniors are lost.

On the other hand, there is a real danger in failing to understand how evanescent and superficial is the apparent receptivity of the junior to a call to Confirmation. It is only a response to the thing which he supposes he is expected to do. Conformity is the junior's way of getting on. It is seldom a deep and real conviction. It may appear to establish a habit. Yet these habits of conformity frequently melt up and disappear in the fires of adolescence. Self-direction with the junior is but skin-deep, and as liable to shift as the wind at sea. When we have in hand a strengthening of the inner powers, it is better to wait until they are beginning to bud. Sufficient attention to friendliness and to routine will hold the junior. Let us save our better gift for the greater need.

Finally, there remains the choice to be made between the first and second period of religious interest, characteristic of adolescence. This is the real test of careful judgment on the part of priest, teacher, and parent. Should Confirmation for a given individual be more in keeping with his development at thirteen or at fifteen, for example? Here come into play the variant factors which I mentioned above. Where most of these factors are favorable, the earlier period should probably be chosen. Favorable factors are chiefly careful Christian nurture of some length at home and in the parish life, a temperamental balance inclining to the emotional, impulsive and motor type, and the early onset of sex maturity. Where these features are mostly contradicted, where mentality is dominant and development slow and gradual, the situation calls for more extended patience. No temptation to increase mere numbers in a Confirmation Class should be allowed to override such careful judgments, and consultation with parents and teachers as to temperamental conditions and general development should always be had by the priest. It is unfortunate that so many clergy have not been led to make careful child study part of their equipment for the pastoral office. Acquaintance with the valuable contributions of Kirkpatrick,¹ Coe,² Irving King,³ and Miss Moxcey,⁴ should be the aim of every true pastor.

There will doubtless be some who feel that my contention for a Confirmation closely connected with the beginnings of adolescence calls for an impossible delay so long as Confirmation remains the regular and accepted prerequisite to the Holy Communion. It is a question worthy of discussion whether this determination of the Church is educationally the best disposition of the matter. If the alternative is to draw Confirmation farther and farther back from the adolescent crisis,

¹ *The Individual in the Making*, Houghton Mifflin, 1911; *Fundamentals of Child Study*, Macmillan, 1913.

² *The Spiritual Life*, Revell, 1900; *Education in Religion and Morals*, Revell, 1912.

³ *The High School Age*, Bobbs Merrill, 1914.

⁴ *Girlhood and Character*, The Abingdon Press, 1916.

then I believe it is time the accepted position of the Church should be reconsidered.

There are other questions which an educational view of Confirmation brings to the front, into which I cannot enter at present. Most important among these is the content and character of the instruction or preparatory training which should be given to candidates for Confirmation. Almost equally important is the neglect of that 'after-care' which is nearly as vital to the newly confirmed as to a convalescent. Its difficulties I readily acknowledge, but its necessity is very great, and the Church has made little progress toward its systematic application. This is the place and time for much of the intellectual setting forth of doctrine, Church history and polity which are now apt to weight down the inspirational element in Confirmation preparation. Into these discussions it may be possible to find our way at some future time. But plainly until we have cleared our minds as to the period of development at which Confirmation shall be usually administered, it is impossible to go beyond generalities as to the suitable content of such instruction.

What I most desire to fix in the minds of those who have had the patience to follow my reasoning is this—that in using the rites and Sacraments of the Church we should not be governed exclusively by ecclesiastical or disciplinary considerations, but chiefly by the limitations or the special opportunities which God imposes upon us through the laws of human development. Our discovery of these laws should lead us to work in greater and greater harmony with the wonderful mechanisms and inner adjustments of life. In this way the undoubted power of grace and the equally undoubted powers of body and mind may work in cooperation and conjunction, instead of singly or even at cross purposes. Under this principle we shall learn from the modern analysis of the interior life of the individual that the good results of Confirmation may be greatly enhanced by using it in connection with the mighty impulses of adolescence, while to use it otherwise is to lessen the greatest possi-

bilities both of the rite and of the person to whom it is applied.

Let us give Confirmation a place of its own, with an independent and self-sustaining motive, instead of subordinating it to be merely a gateway to the Holy Communion. Let it become, in fact, the great educational rite of the Church, a ceremony of adolescence and a Sacrament of the Will, that will which carries in it the making of manhood and womanhood. So shall we give due recognition to that greatest of all transformations which God has written into the life of the individual, and which the race has always tended to notice. So shall we dignify adolescence and give it a Christian ideal.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF APOSTOLIC CHRISTOLOGY

By BURTON SCOTT EASTON, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

I

It is, of course, a commonplace to say that the development of Israel's religion is, in a very important sense, the development of a doctrine of the transcendence of God. By the beginning of the New Testament period this development was virtually complete; from a Being who walked in gardens in the cool of the day God had become a Being "dwelling in light unapproachable, whom no man hath seen nor can see." On this growth in the spiritual viewpoint it is needless to elaborate. But the systematic development was constantly checked and modified by practical religious needs, for a purely transcendent deity is without religious value. Moreover, the Jews had canonized the Old Testament, so that the stories that picture God in direct contact with man were constantly before the minds of all.

The problem of reconciling these opposite conceptions was attacked in various ways, and the most generally accepted solution was found in the doctrine of what we have come to call hypostases, the name given to certain rather shadowy figures which Jewish thought had come to place around God. They were the Metatron (*μετάθεπος* [?], a puzzling conception), the Glory of God, the Voice of God, the Name of God, the Word of God, the Wisdom of God and others, most important of all being the Spirit of God. These figures defy exact definition in our terms. They are not quite persons, and (at this period) they have not the concrete outlines of the angels, but they are something more than rhetorical personifications. They have something in common with the 'emanations' of the Gnos-

tic systems, and the two conceptions probably have, to some degree, a common earlier history.

These hypostases played an important part in Jewish religious thought, and, as will be seen, they were highly influential on the earliest Christian thinking. The bulk of the references to them is considerable, but no attempt seems to have been made to construct a consistent 'hypostasis theology'. Such an attempt would have been contrary to the eminently practical nature of Judaism, which was anything in the world rather than a metaphysic. And the hypostases of their very nature tend to blend into each other or to become mere personifications of the divine attributes. In the Book of Wisdom 'Word', 'Wisdom', and 'Spirit' are sometimes distinct and sometimes indistinguishable. In Philo 'Wisdom' is sometimes the mother (*De Fug.* xx [109]) and sometimes the daughter (*De Fug.* xviii [97]) of the Logos. And St. Paul in I Cor. 2 : 10 says of the Spirit just about what the Book of Wisdom says about 'Wisdom' (Sap. 7 : 24; 8 : 4).

The most important hypostasis was the Spirit of God, differing from the others through being a very definite concept in the Old Testament, where the common idea of the extension of the Divine into this world underlies the various presentations of the doctrine. And the importance of the Spirit in the Old Testament was further heightened by the scholars of later Judaism. For instance, where the Hebrew of Num. 23 : 6 tells simply that Balaam was standing by his burnt offering, the LXX inserts "the spirit of God came upon him." Cf. Josephus, *Antt.* IV, vi, 5 (118), "Thus did Balaam speak by inspiration, as not being in his own power, but moved to say what he did by the divine spirit." So Sir. 48 : 24 tells how Isaiah saw the last things "with a great spirit." *Jubilees* 25 : 14 relates how when Rebecca blessed Jacob (an addition to Gen. 28) "the spirit of righteousness descended into her mouth." The same tendency was at work in the Targums. Gen. 45 : 27 reads simply "the spirit of Jacob revived," but Onkelos paraphrases "the holy spirit rested on Jacob," while the Jerusalem

Targum expands into "the spirit of prophecy, which had gone up from him at the time Joseph was sold, returning rested upon him." Similarly, where Exod. 14:31—15:1 has "The people believed in Jehovah and in his servant Moses. Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song," the Mechilta reads "They trusted in Jehovah, the holy spirit rested upon them, and they sang a song."

The expectation of the renewed gift of the Spirit in the Messianic age is so conventional a feature of the expectations as to require no discussion. But this constant looking back on the Spirit as a gift of the past, and the constant looking forward to it as a gift of the future naturally could not exist without producing an effect on the religion of the present. Indeed, the literature of the period abounds in references to contemporary gifts of the spirit.¹ "Who nourisheth all? The Creator who has planted his sweet spirit in all, and made him a guide to mortals" (Sib. Frag. 1:5). "He that hath a pure mind in love looketh not after a woman with a view to fornication; for he hath no defilement in his heart, because the spirit of God resteth upon him" (Test. Benj. 8:2).

The scribal ideal led to finding the power of the Spirit particularly active when a man gave himself to study; in fact, study is illuminated by the power of the spirit and so made profitable. "Whoever gained knowledge of thy counsel, except thou gavest wisdom and sentest thy holy spirit from on high" (Sap. 9:17). "If the great Lord will," the student "shall be filled with the spirit of understanding" (Sir. 39:6). "For this cause" (because of my mortality) "I prayed, and understanding was given me; I called upon God, and there came to me a spirit of wisdom" (Sap. 7:7). This conception is greatly elaborated in the Talmud,² which describes the spiritual gifts of pre-eminent Rabbis, gifts that enabled them to work the most startling miracles.

¹ Cf. especially Volz, *Der Geist Gottes* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1910), pp. 78 ff.

² References in Volz, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-118.

This conviction that God and man might be closely and immediately united through the Spirit enabled the religion of the period to develop a quality whose existence is not sufficiently recognized. That is, the Judaism of the New Testament period included elements that were genuinely mystical. Compare, for instance, such a saying as that in Test. Benj. 6 : 4, "The good inclination receiveth not glory nor dishonor from men, and it knoweth not any guile, or lie, or fighting or reviling; for the Lord dwelleth in him, and lighteth up his soul, and he rejoiceth towards all men alway." Meister Eckhardt might almost have written this. And the mystical element in the quotations given above is also abundantly clear.

But the available literature shows that the mystical spirit was developed far beyond this 'quietism', to rise to the heights of true enthusiastic ecstasy. There is no reason why this should not have been so, for the Old Testament preparation had been complete; no work describes ecstasy more completely than certain parts of the Old Testament. The Spirit-filled man can be taken for a madman (Hosea 9 : 7). Prophet-ic vision is prepared with the aid of music (II Kings 3 : 15), and prophets parade in bands, with musicians leading them (I Sam. 10 : 5). Saul, seized by the Spirit of God, strips off his clothes and prophesies for a whole day and a night, lying on the ground (I Sam. 19 : 23 f.). And so on. These descriptions were always fresh in the minds of Jewish readers, and the spur of a sufficient incentive could at any time cause the reappearance of the phenomena.

And this incentive was supplied by the wave of apocalypticism, which swept over Judaism during the three centuries 165 B. C. to 135 A. D. The end of the world was at hand. God was about to appear, in Person or through His Messiah, to bring to end the present order of things, to sweep the enemies of Israel from off the earth, to bring home the dispersion scattered abroad, to raise the righteous dead, and to establish His people in a Kingdom of eternal bliss. And this was to take place not in a distant future but within a few years, perhaps

within a few months, certainly within the lifetime of the readers of a new apocalypse. And the hope was set forth in a literature that is unique in the history of religions, filled with hectic visions of burning stars and falling mountains, of great demons and angels with trumpets, of heavens rent asunder and celestial messengers. Books such as these were not produced by men of coldly intellectual or legalistic temper. The writings as they were published show, no doubt, the calm polishing and revision of the study, but no one who investigates them sympathetically can doubt that they rest to a very real degree on genuine visionary experience.

They show us, in fact, a developed technique of preparation to receive visions. The seer must fast for several days: "I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting and sackcloth and ashes. . . . And while I was speaking in prayer, the man Gabriel . . . touched me about the time of the evening oblation" (Dan. 9 : 3, 21). "I wept again, and fasted seven days in like manner, . . . and in the eighth night my heart was troubled within me again, and I began to address the Most High" (IV Ezra 6 : 35 f.). "We wept, and mourned, and fasted seven days. And it came to pass after seven days that the word of God came unto me" (II Bar. 9 : 2-10 : 1). Or the visionary prepares himself by eating only special food; "thou shalt go into a field of flowers, where no house has been built, and eat only of the fruit of the field; and thou shalt taste no flesh, and drink no wine, but eat only the fruit. And pray unto the Most High continually, then I will come and talk with thee. So I went into the field which is called Ardat, and there I sat among the flowers, and did eat of the herbs of the field, and the eating thereof satisfied me. And it came to pass after seven days, as I lay upon the grass, that my heart was again troubled" (IV Ezra 9 : 24-28; cf. 12 : 51). Cf. Apoc. Abr., 9. The necessity of a wait in the open air is also insisted on in IV Ezra 9 : 24-28; in 10 : 58 f. we find sleeping in expectation of a vision ('incubation'). It is recognized that grief following a shock is a particu-

larly propitious condition for the reception of a revelation: "and I was grieving over Zion, and lamenting over the captivity which had come upon the people. And lo! suddenly a strong spirit raised me, and bore me aloft over the walls of Jerusalem. And I beheld, and lo! four angels standing at the four corners of the city" (II Bar. 6:2-4). "And I, Baruch, went to the holy place and sat down upon the ruins and wept. . . . And I fell asleep there, and I saw a vision in the night" (II Bar. 35:1; 36:1).

The beginning of the vision is accompanied by physical and psychical disturbances; "and when I was asleep, great distress came up into my heart, and I was weeping with my eyes in sleep, and I could not understand what this distress was, or what would happen unto me. And there appeared unto me two men, exceeding big" (II Enoch 1:3f., Rescension A). "And when I had completed the words of this prayer I was greatly weakened. And it came to pass after these things that lo! the heavens were opened, and I saw, and power was given unto me" (II Bar. 21:26; 22:1). "The thoughts of my heart began to oppress me grievously; then my soul recovered the spirit of understanding" (IV Ezra 5:22). "My heart was troubled within me again, and I began to address the Most High. For my spirit was greatly inflamed, and my soul was in distress" (IV Ezra 6:36f.).

The duration of the mystical state involves intense strain; "I pray thee give me a short respite from mine unerring oracle, for my soul within me is weary. Nay, why did my heart again flutter, and why is my soul lashed with a spur from within, compelled to announce my message to all?" (Sib. iii, 2-6). "Then my soul ceased its God-sent strain, and I besought the Great Father to ease me from my spell. And again the word of the Great God fluttered within my breast" (Sib. iii, 295-298). The seer experiences flashes of light, hears sudden claps of thunder, feels himself carried aloft into the air while clouds and mist, sun, moon and stars sweep by him, looks down from immense heights, finds himself trembling on the brink of a precipi-

pice (Apoc. Abr., 17), sees a woman suddenly changed into a city (IV Ezra 10 : 25-27) or a forest submerged by waves from a little spring (II Bar. 36 : 4).

When the visionary returns to normal consciousness he is physically prostrated; "and I, Daniel, fainted, and was sick certain days; then I rose up and did the king's business: and I wondered at the vision" (Dan. 8 : 27; cf. 10 : 8). "Then I wept with a great weeping, and my tears stayed not until I could no longer endure it: when I saw, they flowed on account of what I had seen. . . . I wept and was troubled, because I had seen that vision" (Enoch 90 : 41 f.; cf. 39 : 14). "Then I awoke, and my body trembled greatly; my soul also was wearied even unto fainting. . . . And Phaltiel, the captain of the people, came unto me and said: . . . Why is thy countenance sad? . . . Rouse thyself, then, and eat a morsel of bread" (IV Ezra 5 : 14-17). "Lo! I am yet weary in my soul, and very weak in my spirit, nor is there the least strength in me on account of the great fear wherewith I have been affrighted this night" (IV Ezra 12 : 5).

That such experiences are typical for the ecstatic state needs no emphasis, and the above citations are by no means exhaustive. In part, no doubt, such sayings are conventional, but the very fact that they could become conventional shows how familiar the experiences must have been. Universally characteristic of such vision seeing is the sense of personal authority acquired by the person that has been so favored. He knows that the Spirit has been poured out on him (Enoch 91 : 1), and that he is able to predict the future in detail. No revelation like his was ever given to men before; "till the present day such wisdom has never been given by the Lord of Spirits as I have received according to my insight" (Enoch 37 : 4; cf. 82 : 2; IV Ezra 13 : 53, etc.). He can interpret and even correct Scripture; "the eagle . . . is the fourth kingdom which appeared in vision to thy brother Daniel; but it was not interpreted to him as I now interpret it to thee or have interpreted it" (IV Ezra 12 : 11-13; the second clause may be

redactorial, but this does not alter the conception). He knows mysteries that are hidden from the angels; "for not to my angels have I told my secret, . . . which I tell thee this day" (II Enoch 24 : 3, Redaction A; cf. Eph. 3 : 10; 1 Pet. 1 : 12). "God Himself, the great eternal God, bade me prophesy these things: and they shall not lack their fulfilment. Nothing fails of its appointed end when He but conceives the thought. For all over the world the Spirit of God cannot lie" (Sib. iii 698-701). "But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (I Cor. 2 : 10).

The above quotations are taken from the apocalypses, but the apocalypticists were certainly not the only persons in Israel who had ecstatic experiences. Josephus relates of John Hyrcanus that by immediate divine inspiration he was enabled to declare (*τὸ θεῖον εἰς λόγους ἥλθε*) the present and the future,³ God having united in him the royal, priestly and prophetic lines. Among the Essenes, some of whom were in almost every city, there were certain ones who made almost a profession of prophecy, using 'divers purifications' (*διάφοροι ἀγνεῖαι*) as part of the preparation for their vision (BJ, II, viii, 12 [159]). Josephus gives occasional examples of their success in prediction. Even the matter-of-fact Josephus himself claimed to have prophetic powers, and he relates how at one time the future was disclosed to him while in ecstasy.⁴

Indeed, as has been said, the whole period was one of almost unique religious ferment, devoted to Daniel as one of its most popular books (Antt. X, xi, 7 [266 f.]), bringing forth 'false prophets' that met with an enthusiastic reception—Judas the Galilean, Theudas the Egyptian at the time of Felix, and how many more we do not know—culminating in the tremendous outburst of religious fervor that made the revolt against Rome

³ Antt. XIII, x, 3 (282), 7 (299); cf. BJ, I, ii, 8 (69), ὡμίλει γάρ αὐτῷ τὸ δαιμόνιον.

⁴ ('Ιώσηπος) οὐ δὲ καὶ περὶ κρίσεις δινέρων ἰκανὸς συμβάλλειν τὰ ἀμφιβόλως ὑπὸ τοῦ θείου λεγόμενα·—ῶν ἐπὶ τῆς τόδι ὥρας ἐνθους γενόμενος, καὶ τὰ φρικώδη τῶν προσφάτων δινέρων σπάσας φαντάσματα, κτλ. BJ, III, viii, 3 (352f.).

possible. Such times are those when mystic, ecstatic experiences appear in their most florid manifestations. The destruction of the Temple did not put an end to them, and may even have intensified them to some degree; it is to the destruction of the Temple that we owe the great apocalypses of II Baruch and IV Ezra. A second climax was reached in the Bar Cochba rebellion of 135 A. D. Its crushing defeat seems to have caused a violent reaction against such dangerous forms of religious development, diverting the people to the safer paths of legalism. And the growing influence of Christianity doubtless tended in the same direction; the apocalyptic Messianism was a dangerous weapon in the hands of Christians. At any rate, the subsequent official Rabbinism sought to develop a religious ideal that, for the most part, was as unenthusiastic and as unmystical as can possibly be imagined.

II

But in the third decade of our era apocalypticism was still on the increase, when the Baptist appeared to fan the flame into a white heat. He himself was a mystic only in the sense of feeling himself inspired through God's call and special commission, but his fidelity to the mystical tradition is manifest in his picture of the coming age, when the Messiah will literally submerge the righteous in a flood of the Spirit. This was the direct preparation for the teaching of Christ.

Our Lord, however, revived the older emphasis on the constant nearness of the Father, so that the doctrine of the Spirit receded into the background. When God by His immediate action cares for the sparrows, clothes the lilies and sends rain upon the just and unjust there is little occasion for the mention of any intermediate power. In fact, the Synoptic 'ground-work' contains only three references to the Spirit by Christ; men can sin against the Spirit (Mark 3:29), the Spirit inspired David (Mark 12:36), and the Spirit will teach a defense at the time of persecution (Mark 13:11). Of these the second is merely conventional, but the third is genuinely

mystical.⁵ And the first saying is highly important, for it assumes as an axiom the constant presence of the Spirit with man, and its constant efforts to lead to righteousness.⁶ The words here show how much is taken tacitly for granted in the other parts of Christ's teaching.

But to these three passages there should certainly be added a fourth. That Christ at His baptism experienced the descent of the Spirit is, to be sure, not related as a statement of His own, but it must inevitably go back to His authority. Without such an experience a Messianic self-consciousness cannot be conceived, for Jewish theology knew nothing of a Messiah who was not suffused with the Spirit (Enoch 49 : 3; Test. Levi 18:7; Ps. Sol. 17 : 42, etc.). This might, indeed, have led the earliest Christian tradition to fill the gap, if Christ had not narrated such an experience. But if the scene had been created by tradition, the descent of the Spirit would have been made a public spectacle instead of a personal experience of Christ; the contrast between Mark 1 : 10-12 and John 1 : 33 shows the difference between the original form of the story and what Christianity inevitably came to make of it.

There is one further corollary of the Messianic self-consciousness that touches the Spirit. Not only did Jewish theology think of the Messiah as endowed with the Spirit, it thought of him as the distributer of the Spirit to the righteous in the consummated Kingdom (Test. Levi 18 : 11; Test. Judah 24 : 3, etc.; Mark 1 : 8). The claim to this power was embraced in the claim to be Messiah. That is, it is the common eschatological faith that unifies the teaching of Christ and the belief of the earliest church.

For, with the earliest church there comes an outburst of mystic enthusiasm that was superlative even for the Judaism

⁵ It may be noted that this saying has the attestation of Q (Luke 12 : 12; Matt. 10 : 20) as well as that of Mark. The context in both Q and Mark seems to have undergone some revision, but the saying itself is entirely in Christ's style.

⁶ This saying is also doubly attested. Luke 12 : 10 is quite independent of Mark, while Matt. 12 : 32 is a mixture.

of the period. What had formerly been the experience of individuals now became the experience of all the members of a group, of all the adherents of a 'way' in Israel's religion. The experience was unique, for the combination of causes was unique; to the general faith in the nearness of the Parousia was added the shattering power of the Resurrection manifestations, which produced the conviction of the certainty of redemption. The result, of course, was 'enthusiasm' raised to an unthinkable pitch; St. Luke's description of crowds flocking from all parts of Jerusalem to seek the cause of the uproar at a Christian meeting (Acts 2 : 4-12) is a faithful picture.⁷

This was the beginning of a period during which life was lived at the highest spiritual tension. In the Christian community all the Old Testament phenomena of miracle-working and prophecy reappeared, together with the purely ecstatic condition of glossolalia.⁸ As is always the case with emotional religions, the emotionalism was shared immediately by converts, particularly as such charismata were expected as proof of completeness of redemption; where the gifts did not appear spontaneously (Acts 10 : 47, etc.) they were stirred up (visibly) by the imposition of hands (Acts 8 : 17; 9 : 17). For the interpretation of the experiences the Old Testament prophecies

⁷ The necessity of this reconstruction is so obvious that insistence on it would seem to be needless, were it not for the fact that certain recent scholars have argued for Hellenistic influence as responsible for the pneumatic emphasis in Luke; cf., e. g., Volz, *op. cit.*, pp. 198 ff. If by 'Luke' here is meant the Third Gospel, the claim of increased 'pneumatic emphasis' is true to only a very slight degree. Luke's references to the Spirit in chs. 1-2 and in 4 : 18 are purely Old Testament, and otherwise the 'pneumatic' passages that are found only in Luke number exactly four (Luke 4 : 1, 14; 10 : 21; 11 : 13). If by 'Luke' is meant the Book of Acts, the conditions in the post-Resurrection community of Palestine needed no supplementing from Hellenistic sources for the production of any amount of spiritual excitement.

⁸ It is a 'religious-historical' mistake to seek to trace this glossolalia to any other contemporary source. Glossolalia is a psychological (if not psychopathic) condition found in connection with every highly emotional religion; it appears automatically wherever nerves suffer too intense a strain of enthusiasm. St. Luke's evaluation of the phenomenon is, however, a different matter.

and the current theology furnished a complete clue; these were the 'last days', the beginning of the Messianic age, marked as such by the promised outpourings of the Spirit (Acts 2 : 14-21). But who had sent the Spirit? Here, again, there could be but one answer: the Spirit was the gift of the Messiah, "being therefore at the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured out this, which ye see and hear" (Acts 2 : 33).

This conclusion was inevitable, and its importance can hardly be overestimated; *it marks the beginning of a technical Christology as distinguished from Jewish Messianism.* Jesus was exalted to God's right hand as the heavenly Son of Man, but He was not separated from His own; on every one who acknowledged His rank and exaltation He sent the Spirit. Consequently He must be able to hear men when they called upon Him, all the more when they had received the Spirit which formed a bond of union. The formal prayers of the congregation would of course still be reserved for the Father, but private prayers to Christ must rapidly have become common, especially in the form of short petitions or ejaculations (Acts 7 : 59). So arose something hitherto unknown to Judaism, a definite cultus of the Messiah. The apocalypses and the Rabbinical literature know nothing of this, but in the earliest Christianity the Messiah had been transferred from the realm of the imagination into the realm of immediate religious experience.

In this nascent cultus and the experiences connected with it the origin of the term 'Lord' is to be sought. If Jesus was to be addressed in even the most informal prayer, devotion would insist on prefixing some title of high honor to His name. For such a use 'Messiah' was inappropriate and 'Rabbi' inadequate; the title adopted is that concealed in St. Paul's famous *μαραθά* in I Cor. 16 : 22.

The exact form in Aramaic is, to be sure, somewhat uncertain, but **מָרְנָא** has the best support of the evidence available

at present. The fullest discussion of the subject can be found in Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*,⁹ pp. 324–331, where the Talmudic and epigraphic material is collected conveniently. Dalman reaches the conclusion that in Palestine (or מָרָא) was never used without a prenominal suffix, so that Christ

would be addressed either as מָרָן or מָרָן, while the former

title would be used in speaking of Him. The sources for the first century are too scanty to justify too great assurance, but on the whole the New Testament evidence tends to support Dalman's opinion. That is, the phrase δ κύριος ὑμῶν is found sixty-seven times, of which forty-three instances are in St. Paul (apart from the Pastorals). And this number is unduly large, for *κύριος* in Greek tends to be used absolutely, so that Greek-speaking Christians would normally drop the possessive;¹⁰ the persistence of the pronoun is evidence of the Aramaic background. For δ κύριός μου cf. John 20:13, 28, Phil. 3:8; Dalman¹¹ notes that b. Sanh. 98a gives

רַבִּי וּמָרִי ("my great one and my lord") as the correct form to use in addressing the Messiah.

But Palestinian Christianity was not solely Aramaic. From almost the very beginning even the Jerusalem church contained Greek-speaking Jews ('Hellenists'), who came to form a very appreciable element in the community (Acts 6:1). To them, of course, 'Lord' was represented by *κύριος*, and this translation undoubtedly had real influence on the subsequent Christology, for it fused together in a single term 'Marana', 'Adonai' and the Tetragrammaton. In especial it affected the use of the Old Testament, for finding references to Christ everywhere in the Law and the prophets was made extremely easy; cf., e. g., Rom. 10:13; 14:11; I Cor. 1:31; Heb. 1:10, etc. This certainly simplified later developments, but a linguistic

⁹ Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1902. The German edition is less complete.

¹⁰ Cf. the invariable omission of the possessive in 'Rabbi', when translated into Greek (διδάσκαλος).

¹¹ p. 326.

coincidence of this sort cannot by itself account for those developments.

A more important change came with the transfer of 'Lord' from Jewish to Gentile lips, even though the exact extent of that change is difficult to define. It seems fairly clear, however, that by the beginning of the Christian era *κύριος* was beginning to take on a technical sense, denoting the special deity adopted as a patron by a votary, and, in particular, the title was used for the chief deity honored in a mystery cult. For Egypt and for the Egyptian cults throughout the Empire the evidence for this period seems decisive, but otherwise it is not so indubitable.¹² But, with all allowances, there can be no doubt that this technical use had a very real effect on Gentile Christianity; such a passage as Colossians 2 can be understood only against the background of mystery concepts.¹³

Yet caution must be observed in tracing the importance of this influence. The rich results yielded by recent investigations of the mystery religions have led sometimes to the tacit assumption that almost every Gentile was an initiate into one or more of these cults, or, at least, that their concepts were familiar everywhere. This is a mistake. Mystery votaries were doubtless fairly numerous, and they formed probably an especially fertile field for the propagation of Christianity, but there is no evidence for the Apostolic age that intimates that they were more than a small minority of the whole population. Even a century later Apuleius' hero discovers no trace of the followers of Isis until he reaches his journey's end, and his initiations prove highly complicated and extremely expensive affairs.¹⁴ And the very fact that our knowledge of the subject is so recent tends to prove that these cults did not have nearly as profound an influence as certain of their modern expositors believe.

¹² Cf. especially Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1913), pp. 108-120.

¹³ For details cf., e. g., the present writer's "The Pauline Theology and Hellenism," *AJT*, XXI, pp. 358-382 (1917).

¹⁴ *Metamorph.* XI, *passim*, especially chs. 28 *ff.*

Dr. Bousset,¹⁵ for instance, finds the whole secret of the *κύριος* title in the mystery use. According to his reconstruction of the history, Palestinian Christians regarded Christ as only the absent celestial Messiah, so very "absent" that He might be blasphemed with comparative safety (p. 9). But when Christianity reached Antioch, the Gentile converts conceived of Him as the *κύριος* of a mystery religion and as such the object of a cultus. Bousset leaves unexplained, however, how these converts could so misunderstand the teaching of their Jewish instructors; that Greeks could not understand a religion phrased in non-mystery terms is of course quite untrue. Bousset leaves unexplained also how the Jewish instructors would have been content with such a perversion of their teaching, and he leaves unexplained how the Jerusalem Christians would have continued to hold intercourse with a group that had modified the faith so profoundly, even to the apparent peril of monotheism. That there was tension between Jerusalem and Antioch is familiar, but Galatians enables us to measure its nature very precisely; it had nothing to do with Christological matters.

Bousset, in fact, is led by his position into grave difficulties. He is obliged to maintain that 'Maranatha' is of non-Palestinian origin (p. 103). In Antioch, he explains, the title *κύριος* was first applied to Christ in Greek. But the community there contained an Aramaic minority who translated this title into their own language, and from them it was readopted by the Greeks because of "the solemnity and secrecy of the formula." Then, as *κύριος* is basic in the Pauline Christology, it becomes necessary to argue that St. Paul's pre-conversion knowledge of Christianity was gained in Antioch, not in Jerusalem; the story of his activity in Jerusalem is dismissed as of late creation.¹⁶

¹⁵ *Op. cit.* His views are persuasively set forth in English by W. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1917.

¹⁶ In Dr. Bousset's latest book, *Jesus der Herr* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1916), these conclusions are somewhat modified. The objections to St. Paul's stay in

But, even granting the violence done to the tradition in Acts, the Pauline epistles are unconscious of any such gulf existing between their author's Christology and that of Jerusalem. In II Cor. 3:17; 4:6 the point is not at all that the 'Judaiizers' deny Christ's teaching in theory, but that their conduct and teaching nullify it in practice. St. Paul could never have written I Cor. 1:12-13 (*cf. chs. 1-3 passim*, especially 3:22), if St. Peter was preaching a Christ who was not the Lord. Consequently Dr. Morgan writes, "Palestinian Jews like James, Peter and John were presumably drawn into the general movement" (p. 50). But is this conceivable?

Only a real difficulty could have led to such an involved construction. Bousset has rightly seen that 'Lord' as applied to Christ in the New Testament is a true cultus title. And he is right in insisting that Judaism offered no direct preparation for a cultus of the Messiah; hence his argument for a Gentile origin. But he has overlooked the connection that existed between the direct mysticism of the earliest Christianity, the pneumatic evaluation of this mysticism, and the belief in the Messiah as the giver of the Spirit. These elements were all genuinely Jewish, and it was their combination that justified the worship of Christ on Palestinian soil. Gentile Christianity could shape itself in the forms of the mystery religions because Christianity came to the Gentiles in a form that already embraced the cultus of a Lord.¹⁷

Jerusalem are withdrawn (p. 31). And he is now willing to admit that the Jerusalem church recognized itself as in some living relation to Christ, especially in the power of exorcisms (pp. 24 *ff.*). But he contends that 'Maranatha' was a Jewish formula with no Christian reference (pp. 22 *ff.*).

¹⁷ Nothing has been said in the above discussion on the influence of the conception of the Lordship of Christ as opposed to the lordship of the emperor. This conception played a part in post-Apostolic development, but not until Christianity had come to think of the Empire as a hostile power.

(*To be Continued*)

CREDAL FORMULATION IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By THEODORE B. FOSTER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

It has come to be matter of general agreement among scholars that the old Roman form, R, of what is commonly called the Apostles Creed may be traced to a date not later than 150 A. D. Kattenbusch, regarding it as the archetype of other credal forms in East and West, would place it as early as 100 A. D.¹ But, at any rate, the view that this ancient symbol with its cognates is the culmination of a process which began some time before the middle of the second century is not seriously disputed. Thus Harnack, whose well-known opposition to dogma as an instrument in religion is expressed in the remark that "every dogmatic formula should be an object of suspicion,"² admits that this creed is derived "from confessional formulas of a summarizing character such as may be identified from the N. T. and from Ignatius, Justin, Irenaeus, etc."³ —also that it was largely under the influence of the N. T. writers. Another authority of the liberal school, Seeberg, declares that the writer of the *Pastorals* presents us with "the nucleus of the creed in technical crystallized phrases, partly rhythmical, partly stereotyped in prose aphorisms."⁴ On the basis of this fact among other significant data the later and Paulinist authorship of these epistles is plausibly inferred,⁵ and this 'nucleus' might then be assigned to c. 115 A. D. It might

¹ See HERE, 4, 237.

² *Hist. of Dogma* 1, 71.

³ *Art. Apostles Creed* SHE, 1, 240.

⁴ Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit* (1903), pp. 172 ff. Cf. Moffatt, ILNT, p. 411 (also his dissenting comment, p. 346).

⁵ Caution is needed in applying this as a sole criterion. See Gross, *Der Begriff der πίστις im N. T.* (Spandow, 1875) pp. 7-9. "Could the age of a writing be determined simply from the peculiar usage of some such significant term, Jude must be described as the latest of the N. T. writings. . . . Even a church-father could

even lie within the first century. The concession that it is sub-apostolic even so would apply strictly only to its emergence. Its sources, we are convinced, are to be found at a period well within the Apostolic Age.

As a matter of course, the elements of the earliest creeds existed in the common consciousness of Christians from the beginning. The N. T. writers dealt with such points of doctrine as the occasion demanded, but their discussions in the main, while bearing more or less directly upon what we should call dogma, are not to be designated by that term as here employed. If "the expression of knowledge or belief in precise terms"⁶ be our definition of the word, then of course such a writer as St. Paul had his dogmas; but we should prefer to say that his epistles contain the elements of dogma in solution. But the question to be considered in this investigation is rather the process of crystallization. Is there any evidence to indicate that at that early date such a process had begun? To be more explicit, did there then exist any definite statements "of a summarizing character" which were regarded as quasi-authoritative standards of belief?

A widely accepted view, in opposition to the authorities quoted above, is that the early Christian converts neither required nor possessed such things. As one writer puts it:

At first there were no formulations of Christian belief. The immediate disciples of Jesus had the Living Word Himself: the earliest generation of Christians, the inspired utterances of Apostles and other Spirit-filled men.⁷

In what follows it will be my object to show that assertions of this sort, which might easily be multiplied, really do violence

hardly have expressed himself otherwise [than v. 3] had he been speaking of the Christian confession of faith." On this same verse Bigg remarks (ICC, p. 325) "Jude's language about the faith is highly dogmatic, highly orthodox, highly zealous. His tone is that of a bishop of the fourth century." Yet he favors 60-66 as the probable date of Jude.

⁶ Liddon, *Some Elements of Religion*, p. 11.

⁷ J. C. Lambert, Hastings, 1-vol., *Dictionary of the Bible* (1909), s. v. 'Doctrine', p. 193.

to the evidence afforded by the N. T., the nature and extent of which is far from being generally perceived. Even those who concede that such evidence exists disparage or minimize it. Described as scanty, it is treated as negligible. In proceeding to set forth the opposite view it is desirable to have a preliminary understanding. We are not seeking primarily to identify N. T. texts or phrases as elementary credal formulas, though such identifications—wherever possible—will naturally receive attention, but rather to note indications pointing to the existence of rudimentary symbols as part of the currency of faith, the common vocabulary of Christians. Viewed thus broadly, the evidence is abundant—more so, perhaps, than could reasonably be expected when the nature of the N. T. documents is considered. In attempting to exhibit it one must feel the impossibility of doing justice to the subject within the limits of a single article.

Let us begin with that representation of Church life which is given in the Pastorals, before considering the earlier periods of first-century Christianity.⁸

It is of some significance that out of thirteen N. T. passages where *πίστις* = *fides quae creditur*, nine are found in these letters.⁹ The objective sense is well established, and it is not an unnatural presumption that some recognized formula or formulas had come to be associated with it. To speak of 'the faith' if its content in detail were a matter of speculation may be theoretically possible, but such an interpretation is ill-suited to the Pastorals and in the light of other portions of the evidence must be rejected. More on this point presently.

Another outstanding feature of the text is the predominance of *διδασκαλία* and the kindred words—twenty-nine instances in all—whereas *διδαχή* occurs only twice, II Tim. 4:2, and Titus 1:8. It has been noticed in this connection that *διδαχή* is

⁸ The Paulinist theory of authorship is adopted here for convenience.

⁹ I Tim. 1:19; 4:1; 4:6; 5:8; 6:10; 6:21; II Tim. 3:8; 4:7; Titus 1:13. The others are Jude, v. 3, v. 20; Acts 13:8; Gal. 1:23; Phil. 1:27.

always used in the Gospels for the 'teaching' of Christ, though διδάσκαλος is commonly applied to Him. Now the exclusion of διδάσκαλία from these contexts and its use in Matt. 15:9, Mark 7:7—διδάσκαλίας ἀνθρώπων—has been taken to suggest that a disparaging sense lurks in the latter term as used by the Evangelists. But in Matt. 15:12 the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees against which the disciples are warned is διδαχή. Again, in Rom. 12:7, and 14:4, διδάσκαλία is used in a good sense; whereas in I Tim. 1:3, 7; 4:7; 6:3 the word and its derivatives are employed in a bad sense. Finally, the two instances of διδαχή in the Pastorals referred to above occur in close connection with διδάσκαλία and the terms are nearly or quite synonymous.¹⁰ The RV, however, hints at a difference, rendering the former by 'teaching' and retaining 'doctrine' for the latter as in AV. Following this distinction, it is asserted that the *form* of Christian teaching had grown beyond the simple and unsystematic διδαχή of the Apostolic Age and had assumed by this time a definite stereotyped form. The solitary point of value in the conclusion thus arrived at is the recognition of a process of development in the statement of doctrine, which, it may be acknowledged in passing, is one of the positions which this article aims to justify; but if it could be established on no more substantial grounds than are here alleged we should despair of making out a case. The argument assumes a sharp distinction in the meaning of two terms—a distinction which for reasons stated we decline to grant—and is unsuited for use because it really and quite obviously begs the question.

The important thing is to ascertain the content of this διδάσκαλία of the Pastorals. Are we to suppose that it was exclusively ethical teaching? The reasons for a negative answer are not far to seek. To cite offhand a familiar passage,¹¹ "Scripture . . . is profitable for διδάσκαλία" as well as for "παιδεία η ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ." Again, "the doctrine of our Saviour

¹⁰ Both are used in an active or passive sense. Cremer, *s. v.* pp. 162, 164.

¹¹ II Tim. 3:16.

God”¹² is explained as having both ethical and dogmatic elements, and so conjoined that we cannot dissever them.

In this connection attention should be called to the expressions *ἡ παραθήκη*, *ἡ κάλη παραθήκη*—in the LXX always ‘deposit’—the recurrent *πιστὸς δ λόγος*, the notable credal hymns,¹³ and the concisely formulated statements of doctrine of which I Tim. 2 : 5 is a sample: “For there is one God, one mediator also between God and men, himself man, Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all.” Once more, the phrase *ὑγιαινούση διδασκαλία*, which occurs several times, is in one place¹⁴ identified with *ἀληθεία* and contrasted with *μίθοι*.

We remarked above that the conception of *πίστις* as ‘the faith’ is well established, also that some recognized formulation would naturally be implied. Is it going too far to see an allusion to this in II Tim. 1 : 13—“the form of sound words”? The term here is peculiar to this text and I Tim. 1 : 16—*ὑποτύπος*, so one exegete speaks of it as “an example of the writer’s fondness for high sounding compounds.”¹⁵ The parallel in Rom. 6 : 17 is *τύπος*. But this ‘high sounding compound’ was familiar enough in Patristic times, having the sense of an outline sketch. The title chosen by Sextus Empiricus for his book on the Pyrrhonic philosophy was *Λι 'Τποτνπώσεις*. Theognostos of Alexandria, one of Origen’s disciples, made a similar use of it as the name of a dogmatic treatise written for his catechetical school, and Clement of Alexandria for a commentary on the Scriptures. We should be free, then, to render the phrase in this passage “the outline sketch of sound words,” and, since it is further described as “the good deposit,” with the injunction to hold it, we may regard it as a brief and well understood summary of the elements of doctrinal teaching.

It would seem to be a fair conclusion from all these data that *ἡ Διδασκαλία* in the Pastorals was a recognized norm of instruction,

¹² Titus 1 : 10.

¹³ I Tim. 3 : 17; II Tim. 2 : 11-13.

¹⁴ II Tim. 4 : 4.

¹⁵ Vincent, *Word Studies in the N. T.* (1903), 4, 212.

having both a dogmatic and an ethical content, with a distinct claim as such on the allegiance of Christians. The preacher owed a duty to it: in uttering his message he must have it constantly in mind and conform to it.¹⁶ There is no hint that this system of instruction is any new thing at the period we are considering. It is apparently a recognized institution of the Church. The special emphasis on its authority is due to the presence of false teachers in the Christian community who flout it. As one scholar describes the situation, "the Church has now behind her a body of religious truth which it is her business to enforce."¹⁷ She is encountering within the fold not a simple denial of her faith but certain pretentious, and (from her point of view) highly objectionable, lines of speculation in essential disagreement with her message. To these fine-spun theories she opposes her authoritative teaching. That teaching must have been already formulated, and one may believe that it was confined to a few basic facts. A bare allusion to it by the writer is sufficient for his readers and we gain at least the impression of its simplicity by the stigma he casts on that to which it is opposed—*τὰς βεβήλους κενοφωνίας καὶ ἀντιθέσεις ψευδονύμου γνώσεως*.¹⁸

We turn now to the period of St. Paul's ministry. In I Cor. 12:28 there is the assertion of the divine appointment of a class of men, the *διδάσκαλοι*, distinct from the *ἀπόστολοι* and the *προφῆται*. As to their function it will suffice to quote a recent writer: "The converts needed instruction in the elements of the faith, the contents of the sacred tradition, the significance of the holy rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper."¹⁹ The point to be emphasized here is that as early as A. D. 50 the Christian communities were employing accredited *διδάσκαλοι*. "The inspired utterance of Apostles and other Spirit-filled

¹⁶ Titus 2:1. Note the force of *πρέπει*.

¹⁷ Moffatt, *ILNT*, p. 411.

¹⁸ I Tim. 6:20.

¹⁹ J. Estlin Carpenter, *Phases of Early Christianity* (1916), p. 158. Points of correspondence with the Jewish *γραμματεῖς* have been noted. See, e.g., Cremer, *B-T Lex.*, p. 163.

men"²⁰ was available, but, nevertheless, it was deemed necessary to provide something like definite and systematic instruction in the elements of the faith and the usages of the new cult. To the novice, whether heathen or Jewish, would be imparted at least the salient facts about the life of One who was presented to him as 'Christ', including the significance of His death and resurrection,²¹ also some outline of His teaching. Such a compilation as Q would serve the last-named purpose—it is entirely permissible to see its origin in this early experienced need—while, for the rest, a summary like that in I Cor. 15:1 *ff.* would meet the demand. But here in so many words are the clauses of the Apostles Creed, "crucified, dead and buried; the third day he rose again." Observe, too, that the apostle stresses the very words he had used in delivering that which he also received: *τινι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε*—v2. The *form* of the communication as well as its substance is part of his reminder. This note of precision harmonizes with the allusions he elsewhere makes to the *κατήχησις*.²² We have no reason to doubt that the cases of Apollos and Theophilus were typical of the educated class of converts.

The earliest form of the *διδασκαλία* as imparted to converts generally would be oral teaching or *κατήχησις* in clear and simple propositions. It would be concise, not discursive. St. Paul's allusion to 'five words' which he might speak with the understanding, *ἴνα καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω*,²³ may be only a casual remark, or, if we may venture a conjecture, it may refer to some elementary piece of instruction formulated in that small number of words. The early Christological formula *Κύριος Ἰησοῦς* will be considered presently, but it is natural to think of the five-word anagram *ΙΧΘΥΣ* in this connection. It is earlier than the Apostles Creed and is supposed to be of Alexandrian origin.²⁴ In saying this we do not forget that the fish-symbol was not the

²⁰ Cf. Lambert, as above.

²¹ Cf. I Cor. 1:13, 23.

²² I Cor. 14:19; Gal. 6:6. Cf. Acts 18:25; Luke 1:4.

²³ I Cor. 14:19.

²⁴ Catholic Encyclopedia, 6, 83a.

invention of Christianity. Its ethnic currency and pre-Christian use are clearly established,²⁵ and its early adaptation to the new cult may well have been effected in Apostolic times. Its cryptic character would suggest its use in the Discipline of the Secret, to which some scholars²⁶ would assign a date as early as the first century. But the only point in referring to the symbol here is to suggest that the passing remark made by St. Paul in his discussion of the tongue-speaking in the Corinthian Church may refer to the condensation of truth in a brief formula. In other words, we would see in the *κατήχησις* an elementary as well as an early form of the *διδασκαλία*. The simpler instruction would naturally precede the more elaborate teaching. The preface of the third gospel implies such a method in the case of Theophilus.

This is a good place to examine the *τύπον διδαχῆς* of Rom. 6 : 17, referred to above. Have we here merely an allusion to the generally understood content of Christian teaching, or is there something more specific? It would seem that any exegesis of the passage which virtually makes *τύπον* pleonastic impoverishes the sense. The Roman converts are reminded that they were handed over to the educative power of this 'form of teaching'. It is a mould into which the Christian is cast. Obedience or conformity to it is expected as of fluent metal.²⁷ The context contrasts with this the evil pliancy of their past experience, indeed the thought of unreserved yielding dominates the passage. An allusion to the *τύπος* as to some concrete thing would have been perfectly intelligible to the readers of the epistle, and we venture to think that the writer has in mind the simple elements of instruction given to all Christians. The fundamental articles of the faith would necessarily be a part of this, and the method of the *διδασκαλία* would be to supplement or explain the rudimentary teaching. As pointing to

²⁵ See the articles by Paul Carus, *Open Court*, Vol. 24 (Jan., April-July, 1911), especially p. 34.

²⁶ See e. g., Briggs, *History of the Study of Theology* (1916), I, 57.

²⁷ Vincent, *op. cit.* III, 71-72.

this conclusion we may cite the statement in I Cor. 3:1 that there were parts of Christian doctrine unsuited to neophytes or immature converts. St. Paul and the author of Hebrews alike take account of this, using the same analogy of the different foods proper for old and young. Thus, in Heb. 5:11, and 6:6, we meet the expressions *τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ* —*οἱ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγοι*. The writer, on his way to an interpretation of Melchizedek, is reminded that some whom he is addressing are 'babes in Christ', and he hesitates.

Up to this point we have been concerned with some of the data which indicate the existence of a recognized body of doctrinal teaching in the early Christian communities—the material of the primitive *διδασκαλία* and *κατήχησις*. Whole sections of the evidence have had to be dismissed with a glance, *e. g.*, the *πίστοι λόγοι* and the credal hymns. The latter are referred to in Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16 and examples of such compositions have been identified by scholars.²⁸ The notable passage Eph. 4:4–6 has a rhythm suggesting song and, like I Tim. 3:17 and II Tim. 2:11–13, is in fact a brief metrical creed.

But one phase of the subject must not be passed over without at least the attempt to give it proper emphasis. What about the confession of faith required at Baptism? The fact that on critical grounds Acts 8:37—the confession of the Ethiopian eunuch—is more than doubtful does not deprive it of value, for as a gloss it is significant. Indeed, any bearing it may have on our argument depends upon regarding it as such. Individual or extemporized confessions of faith, except as conforming to some recognized type, would not claim our notice. A similar consideration applies to the formula of the baptismal commission in Matt. 28:19. These things may be regarded as valid evidence that some form of *διαλογία* was required of the candidate for baptism in very early times.²⁹ The contrary

²⁸ See HERE, Vol. 7, p. 5b, and the list there cited from Julian's *Dict. of Hymnology* (London, 1907), p. 458 *l.*, as follows, Eph. 5:14; I Tim. 1:15; 3:16; 6:15; II Tim. 2:11–13; Titus 3:4–7; Jas. 1:17.

²⁹ The *ἐπερώτημα* of I Pet. 3:21 is thought by some to refer to this.

assumption is an arbitrary assertion of a breach of continuity between the first and second centuries in a matter of extreme importance, and calls for no further remark.

The formula *Kύριος Ἰησούς* is suggested in this connection,³⁰ but apart from its association with Baptism it deserves special attention. As early as I Thess. it has become the distinctive confession of Christians,³¹ and there are at least two unmistakable quotations of it by St. Paul—Rom. 10:9 and I Cor. 12:3. It is referred to in the former as *τὸ δῆμα τῆς πιστεως ὁ κηρύσσομεν*, and again (quoting Deut. 30:14) as *τὸ δῆμα ἐν τῷ στόματι σου*; also this distinct public confession of the Christian as such is a condition of his salvation—*ἐὰν δμολογήσῃς*. The utterance of this 'word of faith', *Kύριος Ἰησούς*, must be coupled with a heartfelt belief in His resurrection—*ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου*, part of the same O. T. citation. The other passage (I Cor. 12:3) contrasts the formula with the antithetic and blasphemous *Ανάθεμα Ἰησούς*: "No one speaking in the Spirit of God says '*Anathema Jesus*' and no one can say '*Kyrios Jesus*' but in the Holy Spirit."³²

At this point we encounter the familiar and many-sided *Kyrios Christos* controversy, our interest in it being chiefly the light it may throw upon the origin of the formula and its meaning. The two subjects are so closely related that neither can be considered in isolation; at least it is customary to regard them as mutually determinative. The complexity of the problem is seen further in the dissimilarity of the solutions that are proposed. Our purpose in glancing at these is to make sure that nothing is slighted and at the same time to note any serviceable points of general agreement in this mass of divergent opinions.

To begin with, if with some authorities we recognize an Aramaic origin in 'Mar' (Rabbi) this will require us to posit a cultic development early enough to account for the 'Maran-

³⁰ Acts 8:16.

³¹ Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 217. See also Acts 2:36.

³² The formulas are capitalized in WH.

atha' of I Cor. 16:22, and with it a corresponding doctrinal advance.

Or, the theory that *κύριος* is originally the Messianic title, as in Ps. 110 and Mal. 3:1, might be preferred. Incidentally, the former of these passages—the most frequently quoted O. T. text in the N. T.—is reported as an utterance of Jesus by St. Mark 12:35-37, verses which present no critical difficulty whatever. Yet Bousset refuses to regard it as historical, his explanation being that we have here an intrusion of early dogmatic, a fragment of Church-theology originating in some primitive Hellenist-Christian center, presumably Antioch.³³ This is contrary to the conviction of J. Weiss and others that the formula was Judaeo-Christian,³⁴ but if we adopt Bousset's way of regarding this and related matters there is no reason to cavil at his view of the alternative. Either the words in question are those of Jesus or they are primitive dogma, and this for our purpose is quite sufficient.

Again, it is obvious to suggest the LXX usage of *Kύριος* for יהָיָה, especially in the Shema, and equally obvious is the reply that the Christian formula would indeed acquire such an association after a time, but that its relation to the earlier formula is *ex post facto*. Positive evidence of a genetic relation is lacking.

A similar observation would apply to the theory advanced by Deissmann, Ramsay and others, which regards the formula as a silent protest against emperor-worship. That it came to have this significance is not denied, but it is quite another thing to say that it was adopted for that purpose. The earliest adherents of the new faith would hardly have estimated the dignity of Jesus their 'Lord' in terms of the Imperial deity.

But if the two views thus briefly sketched fail as theories of origins, nevertheless they are not without value for our present purpose. Starting from different points of observation, each is an inference from a limited class of data: but the ele-

³³ *Kyrios Christos*, p. 51.

³⁴ Carpenter, *op. cit.* p. 63 note.

ment which they have in common is the recognition of some antagonistic formula, the *Kipios* as employed by various types of Jewish or pagan religion. That the Christian formula actually found itself involved in such collisions is fully established. At the same time, we must carefully differentiate these from a parallel phenomenon—the conflict then going on between Jewish and Hellenistic ideas and expressions of faith—if we would avoid confusion and resulting false inference. Thus, for example, there is the story of the group of Judaean Sicarii who were put to death in Alexandria shortly after the fall of Jerusalem for their refusal to concede the title *Kipios* to the Caesar.³⁵ Josephus is careful to relate that the Jews of Alexandria were scandalized by this fanaticism. But Deissmann, so far from sympathizing with this judgment, which he passes over without mention, seeks to match the feelings of these martyrs by certain declarations of St. Paul.³⁶ The parallel thus instituted is in the interest of the author's theory, but is really irrelevant. It throws no light whatever on the precise attitude of contemporary Jewish *Christians* in calling (not *יְהוָה*, but) Jesus 'Lord', which is quite another matter. That they themselves would not feel the term used as a title of Jesus implied any rivalry with *יְהוָה* is well maintained by Case,³⁷ though their Jewish co-religionists were evidently of another mind.³⁸ In discussing the particular issue raised by the invocation of the name of Jesus in exorcism, the same writer notes this breach of the Deuteronomic law, remarking that the offense was aggravated by placing Jesus on the plane of divinity, also that it was this confession of His 'Lordship' by the Jewish Christians and its flagrant inconsistency with monotheism which especially exasperated Saul of Tarsus. The same "heinous sin of blasphemy" was the offense of Stephen. Further, he says, "This," the attribution of Lordship to Jesus, "was no mere doctrinaire

³⁵ Josephus, *Wars*, 7, x, 1.

³⁶ *Light from the Ancient East* (2d Edit., London, 1911), p. 359.

³⁷ S. J. Case, *Evolution of Early Christianity*, p. 118.

³⁸ Case, *op. cit.* p. 160, and p. 158 for the Name in exorcism.

matter, either in the Christians' own experience, or in their relation to others." They had a demonstration of the dynamic quality of the Name 'Jesus' in their exorcisms—the use of sacred names and formulas in that connection was a common practice—so, accepting this as a proof of His 'Lordship', they made it the basis of their active propaganda.

This account of the controversy commends itself as doing justice to both sides. It will be seen that at the very outset the *Kipios* title as applied to Jesus had to encounter the opposition of those who were jealous for the Shema, and that this apparent inconsistency in the teaching of the Jewish Christians was the gravamen of the charge brought against them. It is equally clear that the point involved was not conceded by the accused, whose program did not then contemplate the radical departure of a complete severance from Judaism. Evidently their belief in the resurrection of Jesus and their experience of the proofs of His power preoccupied their minds to the exclusion of theological technicalities, and they could call Him 'Lord' without conscious disloyalty to the Shema. Of course, the underlying assumption throughout this part of our discussion is the historicity of the early chapters of Acts. But no apology is called for in adopting it. The data, belonging as they do to a period of enthusiasm, are familiar enough as genuine phenomena to the expert in religious psychology.

Yet another view of the origin of our formula remains to be considered, namely, that which relates it to the *κύριοι* of the cult-gods. This is to some extent involved in the larger hypothesis of Hellenistic influence as a factor in Christian origins, and owes its plausibility, in part at least, to this circumstance. But acceptance of it would not require us to abandon the theory of derivation just now discussed, or to go with Bousset in assigning the formula to Antioch. There were circles of Jewish and Christian Hellenists in Jerusalem and it is quite unnecessary to look elsewhere or later for the origin of this primitive confession. It is safe, then, to affirm with

Carpenter that beginning at Jerusalem it was carried thence throughout the East.³⁹

One point of agreement in all these conflicting views is the general acceptance of the formula—a point of no mean importance. It does not seem to have encountered the slightest opposition in any of the early Christian communities. This does not mean that at first it would have precisely the same significance everywhere, in Aramaic or Greek-speaking circles, or for Jew and Gentile alike. But wide differences of viewpoint would not necessarily involve the same degree of dissimilarity in the ideas associated with the formula, and in time the latter could hardly fail to reach a synthesis. The term *κύριος* itself would practically insure such a process and result. As the adjectival form of *κύρος*, 'supreme power or authority', it was a common and natural epithet of the gods in the verse of Aeschylus and Pindar, and not only was it employed as a term of respect to human beings but as serving to mark a strong asseveration could even be applied by any individual to himself. The phrase *κύριός εἰμι* with the infinitive had the meaning of *δικαιός εἰμι*, same construction, namely, "I have the supreme or absolute right" to do a thing. Under these circumstances the *title* *Kύριος* in the Christian formula might be variously interpreted by the new convert, Gentile or Jewish, in a manner that for the time being would be perfectly satisfactory to him. Whatever else such a person might be disposed to hold about Jesus, acceptance of the term would mean at the very least that Jesus was freely acknowledged as the 'Lord' of all Christians. Inevitably the question why He was to be so considered would be answered in the instruction imparted after Baptism, if such definite teaching had not been given before. It is hardly necessary to remark that the appeal of the gospel would affect different individuals or groups of people by a variety of considerations, much as it does now, and in particular that converts from paganism and Judaism would find different avenues of approach to the same goal. Thus the Gentile would not

³⁹ Carpenter, *op. cit.* p. 62.

have much interest in the claim of Messiahship for Jesus, certainly not at first. He would have a very lively interest, however, in One who was proclaimed to him as the *Σωτήρ*.⁴⁰ On the other hand, it was necessary to show the Jew of the same neighborhood that Jesus was the Christ.⁴¹ But both alike would acknowledge Him by the same title and formula, *Κύριος Ἰησοῦς*. As a positive confession of faith this would be sufficient.

But once such persons were within the community they would become aware of a fuller content in the idea. The Church, like every new religion, was obliged to give some account of herself both as an apology to other systems and as a matter of self-justification to her own adherents. An obscure Jewish sect with a radical message and a passionate faith, it stood over against a self-satisfied and fanatical Judaism on the one hand and a mass of heterogeneous mystery-cults on the other. Regarded as apostate by one set of religionists and with indifference by another set, it was bent on making converts from both. The age was characterized by deep interest in religion, and a special message like Christianity was bound to define itself; nor, as we happen to know, did it hesitate to make great claims for itself and its Founder. The Jewish convert would soon be told that Christ was Lord of heaven and earth. The Gentile neophyte, who perhaps had already been initiated into one or more of the mystery religions with the view of bettering his chances of salvation,⁴² and was familiar with the practice of having "gods many and lords many," would find no countenance for his cult-god view of the *Κύριος Ἰησοῦς* formula in the uncompromising attitude of the new faith: *ἄλλ' ἡμῖν εἰς Θεός καὶ εἰς Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*.⁴³ We recognize the resemblance to the Shema, and it may well be that here also

⁴⁰ Acts 16:30-31, the Philippian jailer.

⁴¹ Acts 17:3.

⁴² Cf. B. S. Easton, *Pauline Theology and Hellenism* (AJTh., Vol. 21, No. 3, p. 379).

⁴³ 1 Cor. 8:6.

opposition to the Imperial cult comes into view. The expansion of the formula reaches us in the words of St. Paul, but the *ἡμῖν* suggests that he is appealing to the accepted teaching of the community he is addressing and not advancing something new. This minor point need not be pressed. But whether we regard the balanced clauses "Of whom are all things and we unto him"—"Through whom are all things and we through him" as his teaching of the moment, or as quoted phrases from the instruction then given in the Corinthian Church, it is evident that the bare formula *Κύριος Ἰησοῦς* is already receiving doctrinal comment and interpretation.

The development of the simplest elements of the Christian διδασκαλία which is thus illustrated would be aided further by two important factors, the growing divergence from Judaism and the beginnings of persecution.⁴⁴ Both would operate to induce caution in the training of converts and therefore more precise teaching—a concern to which every page of the Pastorals bears witness and which is voiced in the solemn injunction of I Tim. 6 : 20.

A third factor should be noticed here, though already briefly alluded to, namely, the Gnostic tendency, the beginnings of which we discern as early as the first century. If St. Paul disparages the 'wisdom of this world' and the writer of the Pastorals is not tolerant of philosophical speculations, here is at once the evidence that such conceptions were having some effect on the minds of contemporary Christians. And, moreover, the effect was not always wholly reactionary. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Fourth Gospel witness to a certain degree of intimacy with such habits of thought, and the latter to the doctrine of the true Christian Gnosis, a knowledge of God mediated by the Logos, which is eternal life. In fact all

⁴⁴ Hostility to Christianity is reflected in the terms employed by pagan writers, in allusions which belong to the first decades of the second century. Thus, Tacitus (Ann. 15 : 44) *exitibilis supersticio . . . odio humani generis*; Suetonius (Ner. 16 : 2) *Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis nouae et maleficae*; Pliny (Ep. X—ad Trai.—96 : 8) *superstitionem pravam immodicam*. The use of *supersticio* by itself would not be decisive: the animus is seen in the adjectives.

the circumstances of the time and in particular the intense intellectual interest in religion were favorable to the expansion of Christian teaching. It was a theological age and equally an age of philosophy and liberal education. Classical scholarship was then at its height. The personal experience of Justin Martyr, described in his Dialogue with Trypho, gives the picture of an inquirer going from one school of philosophy to another and after making trial of Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean and Platonist, finding the knowledge of the true God in his encounter with an aged Christian. The incident belongs to the early years of the second century but it may stand as a true representation of the conditions at the middle of the first. If "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble" were attracted to the new cult in its earliest days, yet there were some, witness Apollos, and their number was bound to increase. The Christian propaganda was carried on in the chief cities of the Roman empire and it was in just these cities that the highest culture of the time was found. This is remarked by Briggs⁴⁵ who adds, "It is a mistake to suppose that the leading teachers of the early Church were chiefly of the lower classes. The disciples of the Apostles, like the Jewish proselytes, were among the more intelligent and higher classes of the cities." That such an element could be received and assimilated involves the conclusion already indicated by the data we have examined, that credal instruction was part of the early Christian *κατήχησις*. The testimony of Ignatius concerning the *regula fidei*⁴⁶ as "received from the Apostles and their disciples" is accepted by some as ground for the conclusion that the earliest form of the Apostles Creed embodies the stereotyped phrases of this same *κατήχησις*. Even if the essential part of McGiffert's theory of the origin of the symbol be granted, we cannot see how this invalidates the former supposition. Credal precedents are not barred by the anti-Marcionite hypothesis. Indeed the principle upon which the theory insists—

⁴⁵ *Op. cit.* I, p. 58 (9).

⁴⁶ *Adv. Haer.*, I, ix, 4; x, 1, 3.

that credal formulation is promoted as a defensive measure to rebut erroneous teaching—is one of the elements of the dogmatic process which we have expressly recognized as required by our data. By the same token we are not at liberty to concede that the unknown catechist of Marcion's time inaugurated an entirely new departure in this respect. But while the process of creed-making even in the first age owed much to this factor, we are convinced that other elements have to be taken into account if we give due weight to the evidence. The development of certain doctrinal conceptions and the choice of suitable terms to express these conceptions were the inevitable outcome of devout reflection on the content of the Gospel—aside from the necessity of opposing imperfect or exaggerated representations of the same—the inevitable outcome of an experience which voices itself in forms that are a part of its devotion. The fact that some of these earliest expressions of faith do not assume the form of defense or vigorous polemic but that of the credal hymn must therefore be regarded as highly significant. The time-honored saying "Lex orandi, lex credendi" owes its point to the observance of this class of phenomena.

Before taking leave of the subject it will be necessary to deal with a question suggested by the eschatological expectation of the first Christians. How would such a temper of mind as theirs admit of any concern for credal formulation? A mental horizon bounded by the Parousia, then supposed to be imminent, would naturally not allow scope for anything like the construction of an elaborate dogmatic scheme. But nothing in the position here assumed or in the facts adduced in its support countenances that idea. Accordingly, in our discussion of the evidence, some of which belongs to the period when this expectation was giving place to other conceptions, it was deemed unnecessary to raise the question at all. Nevertheless, it must be considered as having an important bearing upon our main conclusion, to which, if I am not woefully mistaken, it adds the weight of a peculiar emphasis.

The primary significance of the eschatological interpretation of the teaching of Christ is the identification of Jesus with the transcendental Messiah. Now, to quote a writer who is on the whole in sympathy with Schweitzer, "This Person was from the beginning a figure clothed in dogma—not indeed the dogma of the Nicene or any other Christian age but the dogma of Jewish eschatological expectation."⁴⁷ Assuming that the early Christian communities were committed to this cycle of ideas, what are the consequences of this assumption? One has been indicated already: the nature of the belief would discourage any marked expansion of dogmatic. But there is another consequence quite as obvious and equally important, namely, an intensification of the belief in question. The expectation of the Parousia concerned One who had been manifested in the flesh, who was personally known to some who looked for His reappearance. There was thus a new element in the belief—something definite in the expectation which it had lacked before. The "figure clothed in dogma" has been given a new meaning, and the older teaching cannot but appear in a new light. In other words, if Christianity starts with a nucleus of inherited dogma, if it finds its very *raison d'être* in the special interpretation which it puts upon that dogma, the natural inference would be that under these circumstances it was called upon to make some definite formulation of the truth for which it was prepared to vouch. One might add a further consideration, not alien to the psychological view of the case, that intensity of belief and the area covered by the things believed in are frequently found to exist in inverse ratio. In matters that are recognized as purely inferential or highly speculative the normal mind refuses to dogmatize. In matters that are assumed to be actual facts or are regarded as vital and fundamental the very reverse is true.

Scrutinized, then, from this fresh viewpoint the body of evidence brought forward to establish our thesis, so far from losing aught of its impressiveness, is greatly enhanced in mean-

⁴⁷ E. G. Selwyn, *The Teaching of Christ* (London, 1915), p. 2.

ing and value. We may, therefore, affirm without the slightest misgiving or qualification that the dogmatic process is coeval with Christianity. The historic data fully warrant the statement that it was actively at work 'from the beginning' and quite on the surface of things. Any attempt to represent it as merely a latent tendency timidly discovering itself and doubting its own right to exist, or, worse, as a stealthy intruder from without seeking and at last finding a place to which it has no lawful claim, cannot be allowed. And, finally, no discussion of Christian origins, however admirable it may be in other respects, which ignores or (consciously or unconsciously) disparages this dogmatic process can be regarded as an adequate treatment of the subject.

CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY AND HINDU RELIGIOUS THINKING

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, New York City

The textbooks on the religions of India written by Barth and Hopkins have been criticized for allowing too much space to Vedic religion and the teaching of the Upanishads, known only to the few, and too little to the common practices of Hinduism and its manifold beliefs. For, historically, ritual comes before theology and mystic spell before articulated creed. And yet, their one-sided treatment of the subject is justified by the formative influence of ancient religious literature on modern Hinduism if not by its influence on Western beliefs. The religious productions of Shivate and Vaishnava poets will never bear to that extent on current European thought. Hindu polytheism and its gross or naïve manifestations interest only the specialist or the missionary. Modern religious movements among educated Hindus have largely miscarried; the Babu of today does not follow Ram Mohun Roy or Keshub Chunder Sen,¹ but Dayananda or Vivekananda. The svaraj and the svadeshi movements carry with them a condemnation of missionaries and their message, tinged with Anglo-Saxon peculiarities. Christianity is bitterly attacked on behalf of what is called the Grand Old Religion of India with weapons found in the publications of the Rationalist Press Association of England. A searchlight, European-made, is turned upon the evils of our civilization and our worship of might, money, and materialism. Not only Foreign Missions, but our home churches are affected. An insidious propaganda

¹ Keshub's dying words were a prayer to the Mother of Buddha, asking for Nirvana. This was the final triumph of his subconscious Hinduism over his artificial theism, at the time when the true ego emerges and sometimes makes itself heard.

supports among us an Eurasian hybrid faith called theosophy. 'Christian Science' also owes much to the Bhagavad Gita² and may be described as a logical development of Maya doctrine. There are Vedanta missionaries in America and England; they move among the leisure class; they make few real converts but their apparent success hinders the conversion of India to Christianity both by diminishing home-interest in foreign missions³ and by directly encouraging Hinduism.⁴ The genius of Rabindranath Tagore has popularized a thoroughly Hindu conception of life⁵ which would have a disintegrating influence if we were not living in a time of cursory reading and in a world of unretentive minds. It is true that the Vedas and other sacred writings of India have appealed mostly to those who, like Emerson, Schopenhauer, and E. Carpenter, were outside of the living thought of the church and who sensed in Hindu higher thought something akin to conclusions reached by them. Yet it is claimed that the intellectual Armageddon of tomorrow will be fought in India—or on the spiritual substratum of Hindu thought, the philosophy of the absolute. And thus a knowledge of Sanskrit literature will become an essential part of the ever-widening field of Christian apologetics.

² Mrs. Eddy omitted quotations from that work since the publications of the Thirty-fourth edition of *Science and Health*. Eddyism has prepared the ground for Vedantism among us. The atmosphere in which semi-Oriental sects flourish is a misty eclecticism.

³ A reporter wrote in the New York *Herald* that Vivekananda was undoubtedly the greatest figure in the Parliament of Religions and that, after hearing him, one felt how foolish it was to send missionaries to the learned nation he represented.

⁴ Cf. E. A. Reed, *Hinduism in Europe and America*, pp. 128-132. Needless to say the gurus there mentioned are not pure Vedantists but eclectics providing for a certain crave.

⁵ Cf. especially his *Sadhana*. We must bear in mind that his father the Marharshi Devendranath Tagore, of whom he is a faithful disciple, rebelled against the teaching of the Vedas and the Upanishads and the Nirvana—salvation taught by the latter. The Adi-Brahma-Samaj which is practically identified with the Tagore family has no sympathy with Mrs. Besant's reactionary activities in India. But the great Bengali poet, with the freedom and the innocence of genius, lived, moved, and had his being in a spiritual atmosphere heavily laden with the fragrance of the Upanishads. What may not hurt him is fatal to lesser minds.

On the one hand, the case for unbelief is strengthened by an appeal to the pantheism of ultra-religious India. On the other hand, modern apologists for Hinduism point out that Liberal Protestants agree with him in rejecting, in the main, creation *ex nihilo* and the biblical date of it, the account of the fall and the early narratives of Genesis, the existence of a personal devil, original sin, vicarious atonement, the resurrection, the miracles and most of the sayings of Jesus, indeed the greater part of the missionary message.

The study of Hindu religious thought, so important from a practical point of view, is beset with more difficulties than the casual reader of Max Muller may imagine. There is great diversity of beliefs among Hindus. Their mind accommodates extremes.⁶ Their classical psychology is the playground of metaphysics⁷ because an antiquated conception of physiology,⁸ hallowed by religious literature, was an unsafe basis for it. Native writers, as a rule, are inordinately keen to show that India is truly the guru of the nations;⁹ they resent the coldness of our scientific attitude. Modern Hindu apologists have an eighteenth-century mentality. We have, therefore, to go back for guidance to European interpreters of Hinduism such as Barnett and Farquhar. However, the problem is simplified by the fact that the keystone of Hinduism is the Vedanta philosophy.¹⁰ All Hindus do not belong to that school; there

⁶ An unsophisticated British traveller writes, "The grave Brahman will unreel to you systems of metaphysics compared with which the Criticism of Pure Reason is simple and concrete; then he will depart and make his offering to a three-headed goddess smeared with grease and red paint." Steevens, *In India*, p. 344.

⁷ For instance, the theory of the multiplicity of sheaths or selves (the five selves of the *Taittiriya Upanishad*). Anglo-Saxon Theosophy has adopted this dreamland psychology.

⁸ Cf. the text-books on Yoga, *Shiva-Sanhita*, *Hatha-Yoga Pradipika* and *Fakire und Fakirtum* by R. Schmidt.

⁹ Thus is Christ labelled a Yogi. Cf. Sri Parananda, *The Gospel of Jesus according to St. Matthew* and *An Eastern Exposition of St. John by the light of Jnana Yoga*.

¹⁰ Deussen's exposition of Vedanta is thorough and complete and should be used by those who have no access to Sankara's great commentary on the *Brahma-Sutra*. The Theosophical Society has published minor works like *Atmanatma*

are five other great systems, yet there are no schools uninfluenced by it. On the other hand, the Vedantists themselves have been influenced by bhakti-marga and have adopted the Yoga system of Patanjali, although the latter is based on the rival school of Samkhya.

The Vedanta derives its name from the Veda of which it is supposed to be the end, the fulfilment. In a way, the term is misleading. The pantheism which appears in the earliest parts of the Rig Veda is materialistic and amorphous and by no means identical with the monism of Vedanta. The Vedas are liturgical books, they aim at worldly welfare. The Vedanta system is the lineal descendant of the Upanishads, the result of an anti-ritualistic movement. And yet from the point of view of historical evolution, Vedanta is the legitimate end of the Veda.

The teaching of the Upanishads is a prolix exposition of one central idea: the world of phenomena is evolved from the absolute spirit (Brahma) which is one with the essential thought or soul (atma) of the individual. Release from causality (from karma) is attained by union of the individual soul with the supreme soul through knowledge. This union is not reached by liturgical acts, Yoga, telling of mantras, intellectual activity or mere learning, but by direct perception. It is conditioned by pure indifference, absolute stillness of perception and the loss of all desire. Sankara goes further when he teaches Brahma, which is a real entity in the Upanishads, is an unreal First Cause, an illusion (Maya).

This philosophy moves in a vacuum and mistakes it for the highest altitudes; no wonder that it finds no life in it! The initial error of Hindu philosophers—and of many others—has been that their point of view is static, while the universe is not to be understood without movement and time. They have

Viveka, Aprokshanubhuti, Crest Jewel of Wisdom where convenient summaries are given in aphoristic form. L. D. Barnett's book on *Brahma-knowledge* (in the Wisdom of the East series) is invaluable.

divorced intellectual speculation from more basic activities of the mind. Their metaphysics has ignored Nature. The trend of modern psychology is entirely different; it deals with the concrete and not with *a priori*s.

The Christian point of view is the opposite of Vedanta. For the teaching of Christ integrates all the aspects of life, cosmic, individual and social, a trinity of action, a dynamic method or philosophy of life. Christian belief cannot be dissociated from purposeful action, because the only true thing, after all, is a good will. The element of feeling and will never leaves Christian speculation. There is a dynamic undercurrent of thought in the writings of Christian mystics; it neutralizes their incipient pantheism; it gives them the freedom of the Heavenly City.

Thus the dynamic faith of Christianity enriches consciousness; the static faith of the Upanishads, especially as understood by Sankara, is the destruction of it. Western faith finds space too small and time too short and therefore needs a fourth dimension and everlasting life. Hindu thought aims at no dimension; it tends to a point which is dismissed as unreal; it mistakes a zero for the infinite. The dynamic interpretation of the cosmic process by the western mind is evolution; the Hindu ignores time or juggles with it and his involution of the universe is eventually thought away in a mere evaporation of unrealities.

Christian soteriology is a collective plan of action, all-embracing, integrating love and truth, righteousness and necessity; it is based on vicarious suffering which is an experimental, optimistic and dynamic solution of the problem of evil through action, sympathy and courage. Vedanta has no Savior, because there is no soul to be saved, no hope but that of lifeless bliss, no sin, no evil, no world as real entities. It ignores mankind in man and ends with the negation of individual existence; through an assumed pantheism it leads to atheism. The Christian knows that the world reveals God. The Vedan-

tist says that it veils the Deity and then he sees nothing behind the Veil.¹¹

There is no common ground between Gospel and Vedanta. The church has nothing to learn from Sankara. There was a time when the church went to school and listened to the message of Greek philosophers. She studied Parmenides and early Eleatic philosophy and found it wanting; she learned neoplatonism and did not find it congenial; she sifted Plato. The higher thought of Hinduism has nothing different or better to offer. India itself has not been satisfied with it and yet refused to give it up; it has paid the penalty. The luxuriant symbolism of Hindu religions, emotionalism, Avatar-doctrine, polytheism, priestcraft, superstition, the looseness of eclecticism are exaggerated manifestations of human nature protesting loudly against an intellectualistic and pessimistic philosophy. And precisely because Vedanta philosophy does not adequately satisfy human nature, the Vedantists have been better than their system and their practical stress on self-surrender has reached the secret of religious life. We have something to learn from them and from other India sages and seers, namely, to avoid and mistrust materialism whether in church thought or in church polity. There is a value in the Hindu longing for what is beyond name and form, in the Hindu vision of the divine radiance that shines through all creation, the Hindu conception of religion as realization and not mere belief. We may be on the wrong track when we are too eager to set in black and white the mysteries of the Kingdom of God. Dinesh Chandra Sen tells us how he met an old illiterate Vaishnava devotee who was playing on a lute a love-song of Chandi Das and whose voice choked with tears as he applied it to his relation with his god.¹² St. Bernard of Clairvaux and Zinzerdorf would have understood him. If some among us have been

¹¹ We readily admit that the argument for Christianity against Vedantic monism could be adapted to any bhakti religion if the ethical point of view is left out.

¹² E. Rhys, *Rabindranath Tagore*, p. 37-38.

fascinated and beguiled by Oriental cults, it is because the church has neglected some of her ancient treasures. The proposal has been made, in some quarters, to substitute readings from the Vedas and the Upanishads for the Old Testament lesson in a Prayer-Book for the Church of India. The argument is that the sacred books of the East are also a preparation for Christianity. This we deny. Christianity makes very few converts among natives familiar with Hindu higher thought. The latter when converted generally take an attitude hostile to this teaching. The reaction now going on in India against Christianity, largely under the influence of Mrs. Besant, is admittedly based on a return to India's ancient religious wisdom. Finally, great as was the influence of Greek thought upon the primitive church, we are not aware that anybody ever suggested the reading of Parmenides or even of Plato in place of Moses and the prophets, as a means of converting Greeks to a Semitic faith. Why should Hinduism be treated differently? As a matter of fact, the Old Testament is sacred to us, who are not Hebrews, not because it was a preparation for Christianity, but because it was the book prepared for Christ, the book of the sorrows and the hopes and the travail of Israel, its *Gitanjali*, where the Son of Man learned the language of human faith and studied symbols of universal belief. Humanly speaking, if the Upanishads had been the textbooks of Galilean schools, there would have been no Gospel. And if the static point of view of Hindu thought was accepted, there would be only a lifeless Christianity—and somehow, these two words do not agree.

ANOTHER PROBLEM OF EVIL

By DICKINSON S. MILLER, General Theological Seminary, New York

Awake, thou that sleepest, and Christ shall give thee light

The theological problem of evil, with which we dealt in the last issue of this REVIEW, runs thus: Why does God permit evil when He has power to prevent it? We saw that this problem was and must be from the nature of things insoluble and that the supposed solutions were disastrous. But there is what may be called the anthropological problem of evil, a nearer, deadlier difficulty: Why does Man permit evil when he has power to prevent it? The answer is, strangely enough: Because it has never really occurred to him that he ought. And this is only the beginning of strange things.

'Evil' here means not sin alone, but also every wretchedness and pain, all that is opposed to the happiness or well-being of mankind.¹ It has occurred to man that he should not sin; 'sin' means what he should not do. It has occurred to him that it was a laudable act of sympathy, sometimes a plain duty to stop this or that misery when he could. It has not really occurred to him that it was the object and business of morality to stop misery, so far as in any wise possible; that it was really this that started the whole coil about sinning; that a great many other acts beget misery besides what we now call sins; that we should begin to call these other acts sins; that

¹ As I stated in the article on the theological problem, 'happiness or well-being' or either word alone is employed as a sufficiently accurate term for the desirable state of existence for all sentient beings which is the objective of morality. Thus we avoid the controversy between 'hedonism' and other views as to the precise nature of this desirable state. I do not myself regard the hedonist's view as adequate. 'Misery' on the other hand is a chief example of the undesirable state of existence which morality seeks to exclude. The article has a practical, not a merely theoretic end, and I venture to ask the reader to waive any objections to the terminology that do not nullify the practical thesis.

morality is a failure so far as it does not stop misery and secure human weal. He does not perceive that when misery is rightly inflicted or welcomed or allowed this is because it will avert, or is incident to that which will avert, greater misery; or will secure, or is incident to that which will secure, greater happiness.

Upon this nearly all who would be deemed competent scholars in abstract ethics substantially agree; but to *man*, the individual and society in the midst of their life, it cannot be said really to have occurred; and the scholars have not been able, indeed for the most part have not made it their task, to persuade them of the truth.

Since sinning is defying God's will, we may say that the failure is that man has not realized what is God's will as regards suffering. Not perceiving what was his duty to his own kind, he cannot perform aright his spiritual duty to God. He cannot know and worship the heart of God as it is. He thought God wished him to observe certain rules of conduct called virtue, for their own sake, and never inquired why He imposed them on him or what they meant. We may put the whole matter in this way: Man permits evil because it has never really occurred to him that God wished him to stop it by every means in his power. And the objection to the attempted solutions of the theological problem of evil is that, by pretending that misery is unreal or is indispensable or is good,² they still further obscure the fact that God wishes man not to permit it but to root it out. The objection to the attempted solutions of the theological problem of evil is that they aggravate the human problem of evil by making man more ready to permit it. To explain so cleverly why God permits it encourages man to permit it in the spirit that he attributes to God. Man propounds these solutions of the theological problem because he has not faced and solved his own problem,

² It had been intended to offer in the course of this article certain further reflections on the relation of the supremacy of God to the state of this world; but the pressure of the principal theme of the article upon the space of this number of the REVIEW postpones these reflections.

has not really discovered that evil is a thing he ought to bend all his wits and force to prevent. Let him solve his own.

LET HIM LOOK AT IT IN THE CONCRETE

'Evil'! What a mockery is the smooth abstraction! How flat and futile, till we turn from the word to the seizing fact! There is no evil but evils and their source, no sin but particular sins, no misery but a grief here, a bitterness of disappointment there, a grinding pain, a dull ache, a weight of dismalness and depression, 'strained relations', a life poisoned by a poisoned body, a life mutilated by extreme poverty, those numberless shadows of the mind that darken men's days, discreditable failure, tragedies (for the most part how easily averted!), anxieties lest tragedies befall—and so through the whole sinister train. Evil, preventable evil, does not lack example at this time. Our thought goes out uncontrollably to that vast eruption of suffering that we are witnessing—the visible coming of the kingdom of hell upon earth. And yet, fascinated as men are by this spectacle, how scant an interest do they retain for the question, Why did man permit this evil when he had power to prevent it? It is idle to point merely to the barbarism of those who precipitated the avalanche of calamity. Not those who caused it only are in question, but those who permitted it—permitted it to begin and to drag on. Consider first its dragging on. It would be out of place here to venture on novel or disputable assertions on matters of fact. An official person, the British Prime Minister, spoke on the point in an address at Paris on November 12 of last year, in the presence of the French Prime Minister. The task of the Allies, he said in effect, had been from the beginning to conduct a siege. They had had to surround and beleaguer the Central Empires. If the latter broke through anywhere the Allies were so far signally defeated in the plan which was their only safety. Will it be believed that in these circumstances they had had nobody conducting the siege, not even a group charged with the responsibility of looking along the whole line and making

the siege efficient? They had a number of different besieging parties on different sides but no one responsible for the management of the whole. When they met in council, a general or a minister of war from one of the Allies could tell about his front and his strategy, but he showed a marked delicacy in interrogating another country's war-chief about his. He could even go so far as to propose, but beyond a point soon reached he could not press. The inevitable consequence was that vital points were left unguarded. A Prime Minister is disposed to measure his words. The speaker described this mismanagement as an 'inconceivable blunder'. A similar opinion has been expressed by the present French Prime Minister. After the collapse of Rumania there had been efforts toward a unified command. But sentiment at home resists, the susceptibilities of the Allies obstruct. Then comes the Italian disaster and *a little unity* is secured. It is gradually developed. Then comes the great attack of March; a committee proves not efficient enough in emergency (an old truth about committees, tested from the beginning of all affairs and duly set forth in printed books) and at last we have a single personal command, over what is left (or most of it) of the siege, the eastern part of it having been abandoned in the interval. But if a single command is advisable now it was advisable from the outset. No one contends otherwise. In the opinion of the two Prime Ministers the war has been drawn out because such a command was not secured. That is, upon myriads slow torture has been inflicted, upon myriads death, upon myriads untimely bereavement, because this blunder was committed. To the 'susceptibilities' of governing officials were sacrificed the susceptibilities of quivering human flesh in all those hosts. The blunder was the seed of that vast harvest. Reckon, too, loss of troops by capture, treasure spent in vain, the deprivation for individuals which that means, the prolongation of war, the accumulating tribulations in Russia due to that prolongation, the opportunities given in the lapse of time to German agents in Russia, the opportunity given by

the lapse of time for the Russian collapse, the eventual necessity for the entry of America into the war, the prospective deaths, wounds, grief, and the rest that fall to our share. Nothing is said here as to what individuals were responsible or how far individuals could have carried the majority of a parliament with them. We need not determine just how many officials and representatives were responsible in order to say that some officials and representatives were responsible. There was evidence that had the governments of the Allies agreed upon this point they could, with sufficient gravity and firmness, have led their nations with them. But it needed at each step a fresh deluge of disaster to make a little more wisdom. The remark is attributed to an eminent personage in France, "Perhaps we have exaggerated the genius of Napoleon. He was only fighting a coalition." The allied governments could not learn by history. They could not learn by common sense. They had to learn by pressure, the pressure of calamity. When circumstance tightens its ruffian grip on a nation's throat the nation receives just so much more luminous a revelation of the a, b, c of common sense. Oh! what a whipping is needed to teach a little sanity!

And a little morality. *That is what morality is about.* Misery is the daughter of mismanagement. Mismanagement is therefore a sin. This particular sin, being of a nature to bear such monstrous fruit, was 'wickedness in high places'. Of course it is not regarded as wickedness. The matter did not confront statesmen in council as a moral question. It was thought of by nearly all alike under the categories of wisdom, good judgment, expediency alone,—in the fatuous delusion that these categories have nothing to do with morality. If and so far as a decision did not present itself to the individual conscience as moral wrong then in that individual there was not guilt, in the fullest meaning of the term, though considered in the consequences to which it visibly tended the decision in itself may have to be classed as a moral crime. A great many other acts beget misery besides what we now call sins; *it is time to call*

these other acts sins. Statesmen concerned knew that the fortunes of war were at stake, that is, the fortunes of human multitudes; *but they did not think of it as a moral question.* It was not a moral question whether their votes caused a flood of needless agony. Why does man permit evil when he has power to prevent it? Because it has never really occurred to him that he *ought*.

Morality then requires to become conscious of its object, and give the best wits and power at its disposal to employ the means that will attain that object. It requires to find itself. This, touching as it does all that is of value in life, and the whole management of life, is the most important task of our age.

It is also the most important lesson of this war. War is for morality the great reminder. We are slow always to take the reminder, have been slow in these four years, but war knows at length how to stamp its impression on our sensibility in a fashion we can remember—gives a turn of the screw, and then another, and then another. The battlefield seems best to rouse our callous forgetfulness of common sense. The battlefield tightens most tellingly the bond between means and end. In the presence of death and wounds we come nearest to seeing that duty is burdened with the care of being effectual, successful.

At last there is a single commander, and in him, his writing and his effort, we see a clean embodiment of our truth. General Foch, an incarnation of military duty, appears in his writings as an incarnation of common sense, and the explicit analyst and preacher, in abstract terms no less than in concrete, of the shaping of means to the end of national safety. The need of morals is to be completed, reinforced, and reinspired by intelligence. In the lectures of General Foch on strategy there breathes the spirit of pure intelligence directed to the actual accomplishment of a supreme end.

In his lectures! For he, like Generals Joffre, Pétain, Robertson, Hindenburg, Ludendorff, has as a teacher preached what he now practises. Putting more widely what has been said, the most important lesson of the war is that in any complex

sphere, let us say without more ado *in life*, practice, if it is to be effectual practice, cannot be divorced from theory; action cannot be divorced from intellect. So long as we insist upon the superiority of the 'practical man' who has not grasped the principles of his subject we must put up with inferior practice.

As there was not unity of leadership in the field of war, so there was not always efficient cooperation within the governing group at home. For any one interested in organization, more particularly in the working of committees, the report of the commission appointed to investigate the expedition to the Dardanelles is singularly interesting. At the meetings in which the purely naval expedition was decided upon there were three naval experts present who were in different degrees opposed to the object. They were unanimous in holding that, not being members of the War Committee but only experts present, it was not their place to volunteer opinion, but only to give testimony when asked. They were not asked by the chairman, Mr. Asquith. Most of the civilian members testified that they assumed that the experts would volunteer their objections if they had any. Mr. Balfour testified that it was the business of the chairman to inquire, though he also thought that the experts should have volunteered. The death, capture, or injury of above a hundred thousand men, and how much of home suffering, of lost ships and wasted expenditure we may guess, were in the balance at those committee-meetings. I am not suggesting that Lord Fisher was right in disapproving of the expedition, nor would I suggest that Mr. Churchill was right in wishing to force it through the straits at extreme cost. It would be an impertinence to offer, without further facts adduced, any opinion on those points. Let us cling to the official records. What concerns us here is that there was a faulty organization, and that, as in a thousand other cases in this conflict, a fault of organization has given its measure in terms of human misery and waste.

Turn finally to the period before the war broke out. Great Britain had an attitude and a policy that involved her going to

war under certain circumstances in behalf of Belgium and, as her Foreign Minister felt, in behalf of France. But, as has been often pointed out, she had not the armament on land to support this policy. That meant that she had not such armament as to deter the German powers from attacking Belgium and France. She did not amend her situation, it seems fair to say, because her government or people, or both, were not sufficiently informed of the real imminence of the danger. That is, her government had omitted to inform itself or to take action accordingly as to the facts of a matter that might mean life or death to the British Empire, not to say multitudes of its people. Of the want of requisite information, consider one instance. In the week preceding the outbreak of war the British Foreign Minister said that he believed it was quite a mistake to think that Germany expected Britain to be neutral. Yet Russia, Italy, and France assured him that Germany did expect this; the German ambassador at London, as we now learn, was predicting to his government that Britain would not go to war, and our ambassador at Berlin tells that this was the prevalent opinion there.

It is invidious to recall this fact, but it is perhaps still more 'invidious' that the present scourge has come upon the world. It is often invidious to recall what is essential for understanding and amendment. No statesman could say that the war was inevitable. Averted at one time, it might by patience and dexterity have been indefinitely averted. The fact that Berlin was imperfectly informed about London, and London imperfectly informed about Berlin, was amongst the roots of the mischief. Why did man permit this evil? Because it had not occurred to him that it was the essence of his duty to use his utmost means for its prevention.

When we say this it is not merely to responsible statesmen that we refer, but to men at large. If statesmen do not hold themselves to a moral accountability in such a concern neither do the people for whom they act so hold them. The interest of the people in the conduct of government is strangely limited

in scope, though their life or death, their wounds or health, may palpably depend upon government. It deepens one's capacity for amazement to see how passive, dumb, and driven men can be under the rude hustling of circumstance; how little trained to go to the point, to turn upon evil, wrestle with it, and find how to pin it to the ground. They can fight, ah, yes!—whether their fighting force be so wielded as to vanquish the evil or not. But how much readier are they to die than to think!

But if we imperatively require to cite for illustration these imposing and public forms of evil quite as much must we instance the more homely forms at hand. 'Evil' causing misery, directly or indirectly, is seen in the sending of a boy or girl to the wrong school or college and warping them thereby for life; in the mistaken choice of a lifework; the failure to form habits of work in early youth; the failure to provide one's life for health's sake with an enjoyed diversion that does not depend upon others; overeating and the neglect of exercise, which we see on all sides bringing disease or *malaise*, and injuring eventually not the individual only, but all near to him; thinking ill of another on evidence *ex parte*; that easy conscience about the evidence on which we judge others that stains almost every character, strains human relations, and holds back the world's work; those 'misunderstandings' which in well-nigh every case are literally misunderstandings, due to the untrained understandings of those involved; that want of magnanimity toward real slights so often due to want of insight into human nature—want of knowing how to meet it—and which means discomfort for both parties perhaps equally. Or again, if we speak of committees, there are the committees at home in charge of familiar affairs. It has been remarked by an eminent man of business that committees, so far from bearing steadily in mind the purpose for which they exist, not seldom forget what their purpose is or that they have any purpose at all. Responsibility for accomplishing the purpose is divided and seems most elusively to evaporate. The obligations of politeness in listen-

ing to others, of modesty in not putting self unduly forward, of good nature in not raising protests or keeping weary members at debate by pertinaciously pushing for any end whatever, these much appreciated qualities of civilization too easily bury out of sight the interests of the cause that brought the committee together. The members are in the most innocent, amiable, and even charming unconscious conspiracy to let the burden of responsibility for the main question glide off each and all of their shoulders and sink quietly out of sight. This is one of the social arts of civilization and polished customs of human amenity. It is said that whenever a certain famous European man of letters was told, "A committee has been appointed to take charge of the matter," he would throw back his head and laugh uncontrollably. To remember that some end was at stake involving the interests of human life and that the committee's performance of the work committed to it, with a single eye to those interests, was a moral duty in no wise to be escaped, would seem to import an acrid and ungenial flavor into the proceedings. The smooth and tasteful progress of the session seems so much more important than the vague and absent quantities of good or ill with which it has nominally to deal. Why does man permit evil to creep in? Because it has never really occurred to him that it was the very pith of his duty to face and deal with it.

WHY MORALITY IS OBLIVIOUS OF ITS AIM

Consider the fundamental nature of the matter. Man has an institution of which the object is to prevent misery and secure well-being. This institution is morality. But morality forgets its own purpose.

It even insists on its purpose being forgotten. "Since right is right, to follow right were wisdom, in the scorn of consequence." (This means, first of all, consequence to self, but along with these are swept in all consequences.) "Do your duty and leave the rest to God." Men must obey the moral law with

the obedience of private soldiers. "Theirs not the reason why." The rule must be sacred in itself.

The practical reasons for this insistence were and are overwhelming. It is more important for the good of society to prevent certain palpable evils than to secure fresh good; more important to prevent the harm done by fraud, breach of contract, robbery, murder, etc., than to gain new advantages. "Thou shalt not" on certain points must be absolute, unquestioned. The individual must not be permitted to pause and say, "Let me see. Would these evils be so serious that I may not for once in a way do the act that is said to bring them, when I should reap such gratifying results? Perhaps by murder I shall rid society of a bad influence or an obstacle to progress, perhaps by robbery I shall be enabled to place money where it would be of far greater use." Because the consequences are really so serious the individual must not be suffered to pause and weigh consequences, for it makes him hesitate and perhaps disobey. We face here an impressive paradox: just because the whole matter is one of consequences, and these consequences are for society tremendous, the individual with his uncertain brain is not suffered to think of consequences at all.

A moral rule must therefore be sacred. All sacredness has the same basis. The reason for sacredness is that the thing *means* more than it *is*; has consequences or relations that do not directly appear in itself but which none the less it is highly important that we in our life should regard. We could so easily treat an altar with disrespect or indifference. As a mere object it does not compel us to pay respect to it. If we treat it none the less with reverence that is because as an altar it has a place and a function that carry consequences with them; it *serves toward* infinitely more than as a real object it is. If we omit the reverence we lose the opportunity to recognize this fact and profit by it. If we pay it we are simply recognizing the invisible fact that this wood or marble, since it forms an

altar, possesses an added and spiritual value and importance. Since it does not of itself as a material thing irresistibly force upon us a recognition of the importance of that of which it is an instrument, it is highly important that it should become invested in our feelings with a momentous and holy quality, that we may pay more regard to it than its mere intrinsic nature would compel. Just so a rule of action does not speak to us of consequences; labor of thought is required to recall or calculate the consequences to be expected. The rule must become sacred so that it may carry in itself a weight, as it were, proportioned to the actual weight of the consequences at stake. The sacredness is, for the philosophic mind, the fit emotional sign that the rule is fraught with these consequences; for the popular mind the sacredness is the substitute for these consequences, which for that mind are quite out of sight.

This natural state of things in morals is reflected in the philosophy of morals, at least in the popular philosophy of morals, which is Intuitionism. Intuitionism is just an announcement in imposing theoretic terms that duties are a thing we perceive directly and without a reason, that we perceive them to be sacred, with a claim to our absolute obedience, and that we shall upset everything if we imagine they all hang from a 'reason why'. This is really not philosophy at all, but it is a fitting and confirming reverberation, in the ancient halls of folk-theory, where the salutary worship of sacred abstractions is perpetually carried on, of the fact that duty must be unquestioned, that its consequences are too vital to be entrusted to the private judgment of individual men. "Theirs not the reason why," says public morality. "There is no reason why," says Intuitionism to the public, confirming the impression. "The reason why," comments philosophy, "is too vital and easily imperilled to have been hazarded in their custody."

Philosophy does not mean the philosopher. He is an individual man, and like every other must in his life regard the rules as sacred, because in truth they are so—being duties de-

manding our implicit respect since they are fuller than in any moment we can reckon of the issues of life.

THIS OBLIVION MUST END

None the less this unthinking attitude toward duty, so indispensable, so inevitable, can never be the whole story, unless life is to remain puerile and wretched. Much good as the attitude secures, it does not secure half the good required. It leaves upon our hands the human problem of evil. It is precisely owing to this attitude, grown instinctive, that man does not know that he ought to prevent misery. He is piercingly aware of an 'ought', but as to what it asks of him he only knows that there is a list of familiar duties; he has no clue by which he could add to them, or *execute them with an intelligent eye to compassing their aim of happiness for all affected*. He has a set of duties, he has no principle of duty. He has no aim to guide him. The first need is that the elementary duties should be in some sort done; uninquiring obedience to 'the moral law' is a powerful aid to getting them done. But the whole need is that misery should be mastered, and the moment we see this the fatal insufficiency of uninquiring obedience is exposed. This is what is meant by saying that it has *never really occurred to man* that it fell to him, with all his powers, to defeat the forces of misery and secure human weal. Lest his conscience should stray from a very straight path, it has been blinded. The time has come when it should *see*, in order to advance with a new vigor and cut out the path itself further into those obscure and tangled places of the forest of life where it is most pitifully needed. The prayer that the blind conscience would pray, could it see its plight, would surely be, "Lord, that I might receive my sight!"

THE REVELATION THAT ENDS IT

And indeed it is Christ who is ready to give it. For it was Christ who said that upon love hangs all the law. That is, He taught that every moral commandment rests for its basis,

motive, and inspiration upon love, which desires the well-being of him who is loved. In other words, Christ set up as the presiding principle of morality (so far as it concerns man), kindness, which is the desire for the happiness of everything that feels. And love toward God Himself will respect His will, which is love toward men. To say that happiness is the purpose of morality and to say that upon love hangs all the law is to lay down the same guiding principle in different terms. Only as laid down by Christ it is not merely a frigid proposition in ethics, but has a motive-power and an inspiration behind it. All the moral systems of nations have been, in part, phases of the struggle of humanity toward happiness. But these moral systems have for the most part appeared as stern codes or collected precepts. Christ reveals the secret of conscience as found in the heart. He shows that *morality is humane*, has human weal as its object, would not bend and mutilate humanity to an unyielding standard outside of it, would not break it on the rock of a moral law irrelevant to its own needs, but would heal it, after the pattern of His own healing, would develop humanity toward its own real happiness and greater capacity for happiness. Christ showed us the moral law as proceeding from the kind heart of God. Morality always had a purpose behind it, that is, it was framed with relation to the needs of life. He first adequately revealed that purpose. The emergencies of war rudely force upon us the relation of duty to results. He first shows us, not by force but by revelation, that the results duty must have in view on its manward side are the utmost good of human life. He first shows us the whole scope of morals. War in one respect drives us toward the truth. He leads us to it by an insight given to the soul.

Christ thus says to human morality, Awake! He opens the eyes of a world that has slept. The world has hardly grasped yet the meaning of His words. 'Development of doctrine' in one sort there must always be, namely, an insight developing without end into the length and breadth and depth and height of Christ's meanings. The world as yet is only rubbing its

eyes, hardly using its waking vision. There is a mortal slowness in its awakening.

WE MUST SUPPLEMENT, NOT TAMPER WITH, THE LAW

A conspicuous writer of our time has argued at length that since the greatest general happiness is the end, we should in every situation proceed directly to that end instead of following stereotyped moral laws that may have outlived their usefulness or be inapplicable to the peculiar case.² We should give our minds to the matter and act according to our own best plan instead of trusting to established custom. This, insists the writer, would mean a more austere and exacting morality than any that has yet existed, for it would force the individual to calculate, without the simple aid of given rules, by what conduct he could compass the best results in the end. This ingenuous doctrine could not enjoy a moment's life except by a complete forgetfulness of the facts of existence. There are three fatal objections. In the first place, to impose such calculation upon every brain, to make every passenger steer the ship amongst the rocks, would infallibly mean speedy shipwreck. It is precisely because such a method carried out with ideal accuracy is infinitely too 'austere and exacting' for the powers of the ordinary mind, for any mind whatever, that, as above explained, moral rules are sacred. In the second place, while calculation is difficult now, such a principle would knock away even the basis for calculation that we now possess. Broadly speaking, we now think that people will behave either according to moral rule or else according to the simple, familiar human desires. If instead of this they are to behave each according to the original calculations of his own head, on behalf of the general happiness, even such hope as we now have of predicting the behavior of human beings and reckoning accordingly will fail us utterly. Lastly, the general happiness would gain immeasurably if we observed the moral laws of action not less but far more punctiliously. There is no better

² Mr. G. B. Shaw in 'The Quintessence of Ibsenism'.

example than veracity. The easy lying that prevails amongst those who would think it pedantry to insist upon the truth literally in every case impairs (as we see at once when we turn intelligence upon the facts) the basis of mutual confidence and therefore the basis of all highest developments of civilization. If my friend does not trust my word and fancies that it expresses a good-natured civility rather than the facts, I am deprived of any means of explaining acts that may have mystified or hurt him. Heartburnings linger for decades or for life because explanations are 'weak', that is, not accepted at face-value. Kindness in a true sense, we saw, is the basis of morals, and it is far more kind in the long run to tell the truth (in the gentlest way) than the most amiable falsehood, for the falsehood impairs a chief instrument of kindness, credible speech. It is not by relaxing moral principles, but by developing them to the fullest, by bringing out their inmost intent and finest ideal, that we best serve the general happiness.

THE MORALITY OF EPITHETS AND THE MORALITY OF RESULTS

In setting forth clearly just what change of attitude and mental habit it would mean to see the purpose that is behind morality and pursue it there is desperate difficulty. It would be very difficult for the primitive man to point out to himself that he was primitive. He would have to escape from himself in order to do so. In moral vision we are helplessly primitive men and there is desperate difficulty therefore in realizing it for the simple reason that to realize it we must become other than primitive men. Our crippling limitations of mind are not mere wrong opinions; they are far deeper, bred in the bone, inhering in the very mode in which the vital organs of the mind function. They are not so much a matter of what we think as of how we think. Therefore it is all but hopeless to set them right by any process of thinking. But perhaps not absolutely hopeless.

It will help us if we draw a certain clean line of distinction. The true morality is a morality of results. The current moral-

ity is a morality of epithets. The question for the latter is not, "What will be the fruit of this act?" but, "Is this a fine act or a noble act, a splendid act, a magnanimous act, a sympathetic act, an act of delicacy, the act of a man of fine perceptions, in short, an act reflecting honor upon him who does it?" That is, the attention, instead of going to the crop of consequences that the act may fairly be expected to yield, goes to the present halo or glamour that surrounds it. But is not 'a fine act' just an act that does tend to produce good fruit? The answer is that it should be, it should not be praised unless it is, but people sometimes, from habit or tradition, feel that an act is fine when in truth it tends to produce more bad fruit than good. On one side, perhaps, it is the kind of act that tends to the good and so has come to be traditionally praised, and they ignore the other side. To judge an act by its halo instead of its fruits is natural and necessary enough, but a snare. It is natural and necessary just as a sacred rule, obeyed without calculation of consequences, is necessary. Actions and characters and states of mind may be sacred just as rules are. They mean or portend more than they are. They are good, exactly speaking, not because of themselves but because of what they bring after them; but what we do is just to remember that they are good anyhow, for short, and to bathe and steep them in the feeling of goodness. The epithet is a most convenient abbreviation of the consequences and calls out a feeling of admiration toward the act which is itself a kind of abbreviation or symbol for the feelings of joy or satisfaction that would be elicited by the consequences. It is all part of the labor-saving order of the mind which makes life possible. It is wholly right and fitting, but there is a snare in it, namely, that we may spare ourselves labor a little too much; that since actions fall into classes or types, good and bad, we may be guided in our praise or blame too wholly by the gross and obvious form of the type and too infrequently correct and enlighten our judgment by the safeguard of a reference to consequences. And into this snare we have heartily fallen. The morality of results might itself, of

course, be stated in epithets, such as 'efficient for happiness' and the like. But we are under the sway of a morality of *mere* epithets which, unchecked by that reference to consequences which could alone keep them true, drift by their own inertia and drag us away from intelligence altogether.

SOMETHING MISSING IN BIOGRAPHY

Do we know of any biography that sets itself resolutely to find out what its hero accomplished in terms of human benefit instead of being content with considering whether he deserved certain epithets, moral and other, whether he was a great and good man, a man of heart, a good friend, a patriot, brilliant, a genius, a 'leader of men', etc., etc.? Do we find any book, in other words, that asks what actual service a man did, or (allowing for accident) endeavored in the right way to do? If we consider the matter it stares us in the face that some prominent personage who comes off in the biographical assize with solid honors, showered as it were with white epithets, may have actually done more harm than good; and innumerable such heroes of biography have actually come off in this fashion. It is at least one view held of the younger Pitt that he was a brilliant parliamentary leader but a poor manager of a war. Hence he kept his place triumphantly despite many military defeats. We need have no desire to abate the honor paid to the memory of Pitt (who serves here merely as sufficiently remote example, in time and place, of what is in question) if we say that any judgment of him should be wholly out of court which does not weigh the importance of different traits and powers one with another and estimate him according to his real ability to bring forth good fruit in the situations with which he undertook to deal. It is one vice of the morality of epithets that it lays the epithets out in a row so to speak, one equal with another, or has a tendency to do so; insomuch that the listener remains quite in the dark as to which has most weight in the scale in the particular case, that is, which had most influence for good. A witty dramatist has said that what

morality does is to call names all round and sit down content. Some of these of course may be good names. This is what I term the morality of epithets. And so long as it is the chief morality according to which men and acts are judged we shall remain primitive men.

THE INSTITUTION OF RATIONALITY

I have said that the primitive character of our thought about the things that concern us most is planted too deeply in us for easy discovery. It is planted in fact in what I may call the institutions of our nature—language, custom, feeling, habit. At the same time it is planted in the institutions of society. I suppose it is not straining words too much to call biography of 'great and good men' an institution; it has assumed in our time the proportions of such. But there is a vastly greater and more far-reaching institution to be considered, that of rationality itself. For rationality, which began with being serviceable and informal mother-wit, has become an imposing and visible institution. Reason, for the biologist, means intelligence. It means the adaptation of means to ends. It means then the very thing we are talking about. But when rationality waxes prosperous, full of years and honors, it becomes a thing revered for itself. To be wise originally meant to know how to steer one's way toward valuable ends. But now, to many ears, to be a wise man means to be a man whose brain is stored with certain unusual knowledge, whether this store enables him or those who learn of him to find their way in life or not. A wise man means to many something like a very learned professor. Wisdom is embodied in visible universities and faculties and academies and associations and well-known special pursuits, of which it is no longer at all required that they should answer the question for which Plato thought that all reasoning existed, the question 'How to live'? So deep-ingrained in all of us is this vice of thought that I fear the mention of them in this tone will appear unreasonable. So desperate is the difficulty! Let me explain then that I am not

saying that we should not study and contemplate matters of knowledge for their own sake (that may be itself a great item of happiness), but the prime and more pressing duty of intelligence is to focus itself upon the attainment of the chief ends that we desire, which ends we are not attaining. Rationality that chooses to leave that undone I should prefer to call by the name of irrationality. I am not opposing the cultivation of intellect, but we are cultivating intellect at the expense of intelligence. Why does man permit evil when he has the powers to prevent it? Because it has never really occurred to him that he ought to focus those powers upon that object—at least until he accomplishes it.

THE INSTITUTION OF EDUCATION

It is the characteristic of institutions to have been instituted for an end and then to become in the general mind an end in themselves. That is, each one has a tendency to forget its original purpose and become instead simply an institution that every one knows and salutes as a fine and worthy thing. There is no example better than education. It might be supposed by an innocent person that a fairly prominent object of education was to make a man, in the unassuming sense, wise, that is, to give him good judgment in the matters of life, so that he and his might avoid misery and in fairly satisfactory measure attain happiness or well-being. May I repeat, in view of the difficulty of explaining the thought at all: It might naturally be supposed that there was no aim of education more important than to give a man good judgment, to train his mind to deal intelligently with circumstances and situations, with questions and with opinions, simply in order that he might find his way. Owing, however, to the general assumption that education is to give knowledge of "what people ought to know," and the comparative absence of inquiry as to why they ought to know it, I do not think any one can fairly say that the aim at good judgment is placed in the foreground. Indeed, it is part of the desperate difficulty to which I refer that a person engaged in education

would not improbably remark, "How can we teach so vague and undefined a subject as good judgment? People differ about it." Precisely. Good judgment or intelligence is the only means of obtaining our ends in life, or of doing effectual service to anybody. Yet it remains so vague and undefined a subject after all these centuries of learning and study that the trained and professional teacher would hardly know how to teach it. I think by now the reader will grant me that the principle maintained in this article, the subject presented, is desperately difficult to present in a convincing light because the institutions of society and *the institutions of our mind and nature* have not been trained and adjusted to it and drilled to look it fairly in the face. General Foch taught at the *Collège de Guerre* good judgment in war, intelligence in conducting military operations, as any one will observe who consults his lectures on strategy. A school of civil engineering teaches amongst other things good judgment in the construction of bridges, aqueducts, railways, etc., intelligence in overcoming the extremely varied obstacles that nature may put in the way. The conduct of life has extremely varied obstacles to meet and many false plausibilities to resist, just like the military art and the art of engineering. In neither of these latter can all the obstacles be tabulated and all the intelligence in overcoming them formulated (as General Foch, by the way, expressly remarks); such a point can only be approached; none the less it is entirely obvious that to enumerate and study many possible obstacles and set forth as clearly as may be how best to cope with them is an enormous advantage, were it only by practising the mind, making it supple, supplying it with many possible plans (that is, rendering it 'full of resources'), in short, making it a trained athlete in the particular exercise in question. In universities the traditional study that perhaps lies nearest by its real nature and profession to the art or engineering of life is logic, for logic is concerned with the question of how to think rightly, whatever the subject may be, and that is precisely what our need is in life. In life we are coming into new situations

or subjects and want to be able to think correctly in spite of the newness of the circumstances. If we could only study how to deal with situation after situation and codify those innumerable sound principles that shrewd men have scattered in literature and otherwise, could trace failure and success in biography and other records as military schools do, could study the battles of our predecessors, we should be arming ourselves for life. But logic has become an institution. It has become a respected study in the curriculum. It has forgotten the end for which it exists. I call teachers and students to witness that I am not distorting the facts when I say that it has been generally taught (I speak as one of the guilty) with careful avoidance of any reference to two things, the purpose for which we are thinking, and the truth of our thought; confining itself (this applies to inductive logic also as now treated) to an effort to measure the correctness of processes of reasoning irrespective of the truth of their conclusions; as though we ever could learn the right process without the keenest eye to whether it comes out aright in this world of fact or not. Why does man permit evil when he has power to prevent so much of it? Because it has never really occurred to him that he should learn how to contend with it. In the face of the sea of troubles that we call life could anything be more pathetic?

BUT HAS RELIGION ANYTHING TO DO WITH THIS?

Shall we actually suffer religion to become also an institution that, in its preoccupation with the thoughts that have become most habitual to it, forgets the purpose for which it was instituted? Religion is devotion to God, who cares for every sparrow that falls, every creature that feels, whose desire for the well-being or happiness of mankind is the pattern and transcendent ideal for our own love toward men. It is He who has joined the commandments to love Himself and to love men. Whoever thinks he loves God and makes much of that love without caring for humanity is, in the unmitigated words of Scripture, a liar. The church cannot preach its gospel without

preaching this truth. It cannot guide souls aright without helping them to see and fight practical evil as it really is. It cannot pray to God according to its own liturgy without acknowledging the ground-principles of what it has been sought here to point out. The church already stands committed. It must inculcate the duty of controlling events so that they make for the happiness of mankind, and of cultivating those practical virtues by which alone we can control them.

It is because these ground-principles of the church are obscured by current attempts to solve the problem of evil that I asked attention to these in the last number of this REVIEW. So long as we say, "God permits evil for some inscrutable purpose of His own," we linger in a moral confusion. God does not permit evil at all if that means tolerate it. This moral confusion aggravates the human problem of evil, and the human problem, unsolved, breeds just such misconceptions of God as the 'solutions' of the theological problem. The two problems are involved together. And it is only when we are relieved from these misconceptions of God, when we see that His will is turned toward good only and in every sense against evil and misery, that we know His Holy Spirit works within ourselves to the vanquishing of all the evil of this world.

AN OLD TESTAMENT BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR 1914 TO 1917 INCLUSIVE¹

By H. C. ACKERMAN, Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wis.

I have aimed in this bibliography to include all important books and articles bearing upon the Old Testament that have appeared in the past four years. The list, however, falls short of this ideal for two reasons, namely, the want of sufficient space which makes it imperative to omit reference to some more popular works which otherwise would have been mentioned and the present impossibility of seeing many of the foreign books. The latter difficulty has been overcome to some extent by a free use of the *Biblische Zeitschrift* and of Dr. S. A. B. Mercer's special lists in the Hibbard Egyptian Library. The section on archaeology is by Dr. Mercer, whom I take pleasure in thanking for his guidance and suggestions in making this bibliography.

I. GENERAL²

BARTON, G. A., 'An Attempt at a Scientific Classification of Biblical Literature', *BW*43, 251-257.
BENNETT, W. H., *The Value of the Old Testament for the Religion of Today*, London: SPCK, 1914, pp. 64.
BIGGS, C. R. D., *How the Bible Grew. Part I. The Law*. Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1914, pp. 110.
BUEHLER, H. G., 'The Bible in School and College', *Luth. Quart.*, 1914, Jan.
BURRELL, D. T., *Why I believe the Bible*, New York: Revell Co., 1917, pp. 199.

¹ On account of lack of space, due to Government regulations, the larger part of this Bibliography must be held over for the December issue, and the Section on Archaeology will be published in March.—*Editors*.

² Abbreviations of less common use employed in this article are: AelKz = Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenzeitung; ARW = Archiv für Religionswissenschaft; BLe = Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique; BR = Baptist Quarterly Rev.; DLZ = Deutsche Literaturzeitung; ET = Expository-Times; EvKz = Evang. Kirchenzeitung; HČ = Hristianskoe Čtenie; HJ = Hibbert Journal; HTR = Harvard Theol. Rev.; ITQ = Irish Theol. Quart.; LCR = Lutheran Church Rev.; LQR = London Quarterly Rev.; NGW = Nachrichten der Kgl. Gesell. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen; NkZ = Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift; NTT = Nieuw

BUTIN, R., 'Hebrew in our Seminaries', *Eccles. Rev.*, 1914, Feb.

CARLYLE, G., *The Truthfulness of the Scriptures*, London: Stock, 1914, pp. 140.

CARROLL, B. H., *An Interpretation of the English Bible: The Book of Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus; The Books of Numbers to Ruth*, London: Revell, 1914.

CHEYNE, T. K., *Fresh Voyages on Unfrequented Waters*, London: A. C. Black, 1914, pp. xxii+175.

CORNILL, C. H., *The Culture of Ancient Israel*, Chicago: Open Court Pub. Co., 1914, pp. 167, pls. xii.

DAVIES, W., 'Some Notes on Hebrew Matters, Literary and Otherwise', *Rev. and Exp.* 9, 551-556.

Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique. II Bd. Paris: Beauchesne, 1914, pp. 961-1280. Fasc. X: Instruction-Jésuites.

DIGGLE, J. W., 'The Bible and War', *Exp.* 8, 538-549.

EAGER, J. H., 'The Bible and the Popes', *Rev. and Exp.* 13, 188-200.

ECKSTEIN, A., *Der Völkerkrieg und das A. T.*, Nürnberg: Korn, 1915, pp. 36.

EISSFELDT, O., *Krieg und Bibel*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1915, pp. 84.

Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstage David Hoffmanns gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern, Berlin: Lamm, 1914, pp. xxxiv+462 u. 280.

Festschrift. Prof. Dr. Maybaum zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet von seinen Schülern, Berlin: Poppelaer, 1914, pp. v+208.

Festschrift zum siebzigsten Geburtstage Jacob Guttmanns, Leipzig: Fock, 1915, pp. xvi+283 mit 1 Taf.

Festschrift. Ernst Windisch zum 70. Geburtstag am 4. 9. 1914 dargebracht v. Freunden u. Schülern, Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1914, pp. viii+360 u. 16.

FLETCHER, W. A., *The Nature and History of the Bible*, Baltimore: J. H. Furst Co., 1917, pp. xiv+175.

FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J., 'A Literary Appreciation of the History of Israel', *Interp.* 10, 51-61.

FORSYTH, P. T., 'The Efficiency and Sufficiency of the Bible', *BR2*, 10-30.

FOX, R. J., *More Rays of the Dawn or Teachings on some Old Testament Problems*, London: Paul, 1914, pp. 384.

GARVIE, A. E., 'Can the Lit. of a Divine Revelation be dealt with by Historical Science?', *ET25*, 156-161.

GILMORE, G. W., 'Scriptures Ethnic and Hebrew-Christian', *BW42*, 361-367.

GIRGENSOHN, K., *Der Schriftbeweiss in der evangelischen Dogmatik einst und jetzt*, Leipzig: Deichert, 1914, pp. iii+78.

GREENE, W. B., JR., 'The Bible as the Text-Book in Sociology', *PTR12*, 1-22.

Theologisch Tijdschrift; PTR=Princeton Theol. Rev.; RHR=Revue de l'histoire des religions; Rbén=Revue bénédictine; ROC=Revue de l'Orient Chrétien; RSPT=Revue des sciences philos. et théol.; RSR=Recherches de Science Religieuse; RTP=Revue de théologie et de philosophie; RTQ=Revue de Théol. et des Quest. Relig.; StKr=Theologische Studien und Kritiken; Stst (or Stud)=Die Studierstube; ThG=Theologie und Glaube; ThT=Theologisch Tijdschrift; ThQ=Theolog. Quartalschrift; TPM=Theolog. prakt. Monatsschrift; TPQ=Theolog. prakt. Quartalschrift; TQ=Theolog. Quartalschrift; USM=Union Seminary Magazine; ZKT=Zeitschrift f. katholische Theologie.

GREGG, J. A. F., 'Use of the Old Testament', ET, 1915, May.

GRESSMANN, H., *Die Anfänge Israels* (2. Buch Moses bis Richter und Ruth), (Die Schriften des A.T., 1, 2), 241-292, mit Doppelkarte, vii, 1914.

GUNKEL, H., 'Was haben wir am A. T.?' Deutsche Rundschau, 161, 215-241.

GUNKEL, H., 'Kriegsfrömmigkeit im A. T.', Internat. Monatsschrift, 9, 723-758.

HAGEN, M., *Realia biblica, geographica, naturalia, archaeologica, quibus compendium introductionis completetur et illustratur*, Paris: Lethielleux, 1914, pp. viii + 728.

HALÉVY, J., *Recherches Biblique*, Paris: E. Leroux, 1914, pp. 851.

HALLER, M., *Das Judentum. Geschichtsschreibung, Prophetie und Gesetzgebung nach dem Exil*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1914, (Die Schriften des A.T. II 3), 225-310, xviii.

HASTINGS, J., ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vols. VI-IX, New York: Scribner's, 1914.

HASTINGS, J., ed., *The Greater Men and Women of the Bible*, II. *Moses to Samson*, Edinburgh: Clark, 1914.

HITCHCOCK, F. K. M., *Hebrew Types*, London: Griffith, 1914.

Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur, 17. Bd., Berlin: Poppelauer, 1914, pp. 267+43.

JOHNSTON, G., 'The Authority of Holy Scriptures', PTR12, 454-481.

KAUTSCH, K., *Die Philosophie des A. T.*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1914, pp. 56.

KAY, D. M., 'Value of the Old Testament to the Church', CQ2, 773-785.

KITTEL, R., 'Vom Kriege in Israel', AelKz48, 50-56; 74-78.

KITTEL, R., *Judeneidschaft oder Gotteslästerung?* Appendix: *Die Juden und der gegenwärtige Krieg*, Leipzig: Wigand, 1914, pp. iv+92.

'Lingue e litterature Semitische', Riv. d. stud. or. 6, 551-764.

LUEGS, S., *Biblische Realkonkordanz*, Regensburg: Verlagsanst., 1914, 2. Bde.

MAICHLE, A., *Das Decret 'De editione et usu sacrorum librorum'. Seine Entstehung und Erklärung*, Freiburg: Herder, 1914, pp. xvi+118.

MARTI, K., *Julius Wellhausen. Studien zur semitischen Philologie und Religionsgeschichte*, Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1914, pp. 388.

MARTI, K., 'Bibliographie', ZatW34, 155-160.

MARGOLIOUTH, D. S., 'The Bible of the Jews', Luth. Quart. 1914, I, 66-85.

MARGOLIS, M. L., *The Story of Bible Translation*, Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Soc., 1917, pp. 135.

MAYNARD, J. D., 'The Old Testament and the War', Interp. 14, 15-30.

MCCONNELL, F. J., *Understanding the Scriptures*, Meth. Book Concern, 1917.

MCFADYEN, J. E., 'The Old Testament and the Modern World', Exp. 7, 1-19.

MEHLHORN, P., *Die Bibel, ihr Inhalt u. geschichtlicher Boden*, Leipzig: Barth, 1914, pp. 96.

MONNIER, H., *Qu'est-ce que la Bible?* Paris: Fischbacher, 1914, pp. 151.

MORGAN, G. C., *The Graded Bible*. I. *The Pentateuch and the Gospel of Mark*, London: Hodder, 1915, pp. 210.

NEWMAN, C. E., *The Bible in the Pulpit*, London: Skeffington, 1914.

NIKEL, J., *Der Friedensgedanke im A. T.*, Breslau Univ., 1914, pp. 19.

OBINK, T. H., 'Een en ander over de studie van het O. T.' (Stemmen voor Waarheid en Vrede 52, 2).

ORR, J., ed., *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, Chicago: Howard-Severance Co., 1915, Vols. I-V.

SICKENBERGER, J., 'Katholische Bibelforschung und Wissenschaft', Monatsbl. f. d. kath. Religionsunterr. 16, 129-138.

SMITH, G., 'Value of Familiarity with the Ipsissima Verba of the Bible as a Method of Interpretation', Interp. 1915, Jan.

SWEET, L. M., 'Psychological Factors in the Structure of the Bible', BR1, 17-47.

TENNANT, A. M., *Earthen Vessels or Women of the Old Testament*, London: Mowbray, 1914, pp. vi + 183.

Theologischer Jahresbericht xxxii, III: *Das A. T., bearbeitet von Westphal*, Leipzig: Heinsius Nachf., 1914, pp. vi + 96 [305-400].

THYSSEN, P., *Ist die Bibel noch Autorität für uns Christen?* Bremen: Morgenbesser, 1914, pp. 16.

WEHLE, T., *Origin and Meaning of the Old Testament*, New York: R. H. Fenco, 1914, pp. 199.

WILLIAMS, C. B., 'Grammatical Glimpses at some Scriptures', Rev. and Exp., 1915, Apr.

WILLIS, A., *The Unity of the Bible*, London: Nisbet & Co., 1916, pp. xi + 84.

WITHAM, A. R., *The Trustworthiness of the Bible*, London: Longmans, 1914.

WORK, E. W., *The Bible in English Literature*, New York: Revell Co., 1917, pp. 287.

WRIGHT, T. H., *Open Roads of Thought in the Bible and in Poetry*, London: Oliphant, 1914.

WUNSCH, W. F., 'The Bible of the Future', NCR22, 161-167.

Barton classifies Old Testament into Poetry (lyric, epic, elegiac, didactic); Historiography; Prophetic; Apocalypse; Short-story; Letters. **Bennett**—An admirable little apologetic from the modern point of view. **Biggs** successfully fulfills a want for the general reader. **Buehler**—Practical suggestions. **Burrell** aims to present the value of HS for Christian living on behalf of those who feel called to the ministry. **Butin** advocates the training of Hebrew specialists in the Catholic Church. **Carlyle** comments on recent controversies. **Carroll's** position is traditional and conservative. **Cheyne**—One of his latest works produced under the delusion that all Old Testament religion and culture were in reality North Arabian. **Cornill**—This English translation contains valuable chapters on (1) the early history of Israel, (2) Moses, (3) the education of children in ancient Israel, (4) music in the Old Testament and (5) the psalms in universal literature. **Dictionnaire**—Fourth edition under the direction of A. D'Alès. Con-

tains Religion of Iran, treating of the influence of Parseism on Judaism; Jephte by A. Condamin who advocates the literal conception of the Jephthah offering. **Diggle**—Peace promised only as the fruit of righteousness. Nothing in Bible contrary to righteous war. **Eager** reviews the attitude of the Popes to the Bible, and comments upon the significance of Pope Benedict XV's interest in the circulation of the Scriptures among the people. **Eckstein**—A lecture. **Eissfeldt** discusses the wars of the Old Testament and concludes (considering also the New Testament position) that the Bible forbids war for national and material aims but consents to a struggle against moral evils. **Hoffmann's Festschrift** consists of two parts: German and Hebrew. **Maybaum's Festschrift** contains material relevant to Judaism; **Guttmann's** contains writings bearing upon the science of Judaism; **Windisch's** includes a number of thoughtful articles of Biblical interest. **Fletcher**—The Bible from the Roman Catholic viewpoint. **Foakes-Jackson** points out the sound and sober ideals of righteousness manifested in Israel with which he contrasts the failings of later Judaism. **Forsyth** maintains that the authority of the Bible is in its 'Gospel to the conscience'. **Garvie** holds that revelation cannot be brought within the fetters of a mechanical causality, but does not rule out the application of historical methods of interpretation to the Bible provided a distinction is made between phenomenal and noumenal aspects. **Gilmore** very liberally accepts the general inspiration of all ethnical writings and advocates their claim to transmit revelation. **Girgensohn** shows how the critical position of pre-reformation times and catholic authority undermined the foundation of evangelical dogmatic theology. **Greene** contends that the Bible lays the foundation of human society and is as truly an authority in sociology as in dogmatics or ethics. **Gressmann**—New translation and exposition. **Gunkel** gives reasons why the Bible, although no longer considered the 'word of God', is nevertheless an historical monument of powerful influence in moral-religious relations. His idea in *Kriegsfrömmigkeit* is that when the

religion was national it was bound up with war. In consequence of overpowering world empires and through prophetic influence a revolution set in. **Hagen's** work is a new revised epitome of the 'Cursus Scripturæ Sacrae'. There are three systematic parts: Geographie, Natural Science and Archæologie. Contains three maps and numerous plans of the temple. **Halévy**—This is the fifth volume of researches, containing the books of Haggai, Zechariah, Joel, Malachi and Isaiah I-39. First published in the *Revue Semitique*. **Haller** throughout his treatment of Judaism seeks to comprehend the distinctive character of the Jewish people. **Hastings'** ERE contains many important articles, written scientifically, on the Old Testament. The *Greater Men and Women* is written with a practical aim. The bibliographies attached are valuable. **Johnston's** thesis is that the Bible possesses authority as a source, not a repetition, of revelation and devotional stimulus. **Kautsch** elucidates selected texts from Proverbs, Job and Ecclesiastes. **Kay**—A critical use of the Old Testament is indispensable to picture intelligently the religious life in Israel. **Kittel** presents an apologetic for war based upon a compilation of Israel's 'holy wars'. Special emphasis is placed upon the Psalms. His *Judeneindschaft* is a popular, but also critical, discussion of the relation between the Jewish anger against Yahweh's enemies and the present hate of Germany towards its enemies. **Luegs**—Sixth edition revised and improved by B. Mairhofer. 'Lingue e lit. Semitische' includes Hebrew literature and the post-Biblical literature of Judaism. **Maichle** discusses the papal decree on Biblical studies. **Margolis'** book is not a reference-work but a description of the great cultural and religious upheavals which accompanied the epoch-making translations of the Scriptures. **Maynard**—The Old Testament along lines that point forward to fulfilment in the New Testament cannot be used in support of war. **McFadyen** treats thoughtfully of the vital message of the Old Testament for modern life in all its relations. **Mehlhorn's** is an instruction book. This is the eighth edition much improved. **Monnier**—

The second edition. **Morgan**—Popular. **Newman**—Both exegetical and instructive. **Nikel** thinks that the prophetic conception of a world peace lay in the far distant future and suggests that such can only be built upon ethical-religious grounds. **Orr**—The ISBE may be said to be, as a whole, useless for critical work save in the few articles contributed by competent scholars. **Sickenberger** shows in much detail how the catholic student must work according to scientific methods. **Smith's** article contains suggestions for Bible teaching in schools. **Sweet** treats synoptically the psychology of the Bible writers, showing the minds of those writers in action. Some interesting suggestions are made. **Tenant**—Character studies. **The Theologischer Jahresbericht** contains Old Testament literature for the year 1912. **Thomas**—Unsympathetic polemic against German work. **Thyssen's** lecture advocates the authority of the Bible in spite of the fallacy of verbal inspiration. **Wehle**—Intended to serve as introductory to more detailed study. Textbook for lay readers. **Willis** restates the traditional belief. The unity of the Bible is due to the underlying *purpose* in God's plan of salvation. The work suffers from the common inaccuracies of a non-scientific attitude toward the Scriptural text. **Work**—'A volume of singular freshness' to be read with delight by all interested in the Scriptures from the literary point of view. **Wright** presents the Biblical teaching and its modifications in poetry concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil, Satan, immortality. **Wunsch** believes the Bible has the potentiality of unfolding its inner, spiritual significance to meet the needs of the present day.

I a. CRITICISM

ALLEMAN, H. C., 'Present Status of Old Testament Criticism', Luth. Quart., 1915, Jan.

BAUMGÄRTEL, F., *Elohim ausserhalb des Pentateuch*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914, pp. 90.

BOX, G. H., 'Some Recent Contributions to Old Testament Studies', CQR80, 50-113.

CELLINI, A., *Ultima crisi biblica. Cause e remedi*, Monza: Artigianelli, 1914, pp. xx+202.

DAHSE, J., 'Is the Documentary Theory Tenable?' BS71, 95-104.

DIGGLE, J. W., 'Biblical Criticism', Interp. II, 129-142.

FLOURNOY, P. P., 'Present Trend of Old Testament Criticism', USM, 1914, Oct.

HALL, F. J., *The Bible and Modern Criticism*, Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co., 1915, pp. 41.

HAUSSLEITER, J., 'Bibelglaube und Bibelkritik', AelKz47, 650-654; 674-679.

H (ENGSTENBERG, E. W.), 'Urteil eines Orientalisten über die Wellhausensche Schule', Ev. Kz88, I, 10f.

H (ENGSTENBERG, E. W.), 'Zeugnisse eines lutherischen Professors wider die modern-rationalistische Schriftkritik', *ib.*, No. 5, 68-72.

HUGO, L., 'Fundamentalfragen der Bibelkritik', TPM23, 725-730.

MONTGOMERY, J. A., 'Present Tendencies in Old Testament Criticism', BW43, 310-320.

PEJPER, F., 'Biblejskaja kritika v Hollandiji', HČ93, 1352-1373.

POPE, H., 'Origen and the Biblical Question', ITQ11, 41-61.

PRICE, I. M., 'Some Methods of Old Testament Exegetes before Modern Times', BW47, 237-243.

PRICE, I. M., 'Some Methods and Problems of the Modern Old Testament', BW47, 298-305.

RICHARDSON, G. H., 'A Plea for Unprejudiced Historical Biblical Study', BW45, 160-165.

SCHODDE, G. H., 'The Record and Work of Conservative Old Testament Criticism', BRI, 101-138.

SMYTH, J. P., *Our Bible in the Making as seen by Modern Research*, London: Low, 1914, pp. 222.

WELCH, A. C., 'The Present Position of Old Testament Criticism', Exp. 6, 518-529.

WIENER, H. M., 'Elohim outside the Pentateuch and Baumgärtel's Investigation', BS72, 308-333.

Baumgärtel's pamphlet investigates the occurrence of Elohim outside the Pentateuch in relation to the Pentateuchal problem, with special reference to the Septuagint text. To be supplemented later with the tracing of Elohim in the Pentateuch itself. **Box** concludes after noting how the more extreme positions of purely literary criticism have been modified by the introduction of new factors that real progress has been made and is continuing. **Cellini** would subordinate exegesis to dogmatic theology, but advocates at the same time a progressive position. **Dahse's** paper is translated by F. C. Geiser. **Diggle** states that reverent criticism is a great emancipator in the service of truth. **Hall** defines inspiration as the over-ruling work of the Holy Spirit in the production of the Bible as a finished and unified product. **Haussleiter** attempts to show

the compatibility of belief in the Bible with Biblical criticism. **Hugo** advocates Cellini's position in comparison with the course of modern thought. **Montgomery** says that Old Testament study has been weaned from its old status of a purely theological discipline. **Pejper** sketches the history of criticism in Holland from the middle of the eighteenth century to the present time. **Pope** discusses Origen in relation to the critical study of the Bible. **Price**—The six schools of exegetes from the Rabbinic period to post-Reformation times are treated historically and several principles of sound interpretation are sifted out of mountains of chaff, such as the principles of Authenticity, Documentary Integrity, Textual Reconstruction (historical, political and religious motive), Archæology, Literary Style and Linguistic Research. **Price** also presents in *Some Methods and Problems* some of the standard principles and methods which should be adopted. **Richardson** writes of the danger of attributing too much authority to certain archæological facts. Illustrates by a discussion of Genesis 14. **Schodde**—Largely negative and apologetic. **Welch** demands the modification of the Wellh. theory in the light of new facts. **Wiener** reviews Baumgärtel's book and makes critical notes to show that the God-names of the MT were added subsequently with a definite purpose.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

BADÈ, W. F., *The Old Testament in the Light of Today*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1915, pp. xxii+326.

BARNES, W. E., *A Companion to Biblical Studies*, Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1916, pp. x+677, mps. 10.

Biblisches Handbuch für höhere Lehranstalten, Bonn: Haustein, 1914, pp. viii+165.

BLAKINSTON, A. B., *The Bible of Today*, Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1914, pp. xvi+240.

CREELMAN, H., *An Intro. to the Old Testament chronologically arranged*, New York: Macmillan, 1917, pp. xxiv+383.

DRIVER, S. R., *An Intro. to the Literature of the Old Testament*, New York: Scribner's, 1914, pp. xi+577.

GAUTIER, L., *Intro. à l'Ancien Testament*, Lausanne: Bridel, 1914, pp. xvi+547.

KIRKPATRICK, A. F., *The Divine Library of the Old Testament, its Origin, Preservation, Inspiration and Permanent Value*, London: Macmillan, 1914, pp., xvii+155.

PEAKE, A. S., *The Bible, its Origin, its Significance and its abiding Worth*, London: Hodder, 1914.

SANDERS, F. K., and SHERMAN, H. A., *How to Study the Old Testament*, New York: Scribner's, 1915, pp. vi+64.

SELLIN, E., *Einleitung in das A. T.*, Leipzig: Quelle, 1914, pp. xv+168.

SWETE, H. B., *An Intro. to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1914, pp. 626.

WOOD, I. F., and GRANT, E., *The Bible as Literature*, New York: Abingdon Pr., 1914, pp. 346.

Badè's book is a stimulating but somewhat unsympathetic study in Hebrew morals. Jeremiah is especially well treated. **Barnes**—A revised edition of *The Cambridge Companion to the Bible*. **Blakiston** discusses the modern critical method of study with a view to envisage the atmosphere, intellectual and religious, which is created as a result of that treatment. Useful for general reader. **Creelman**'s volume is simply invaluable for instructor as well as student for quick reference to the conclusions of modern Scholarship. **Driver**—In this new edition the bibliography and references have been brought up to date. *Isaiah 22:1-14* has been rewritten, and other slight improvements have been introduced. A note on the value of the Divine names and some other matter has been collected in the new Addenda. **Gautier**—Second edition carefully revised. **Sanders** and **Sherman**—Outlines based upon Sanders's *History of the Hebrews*, to proportion the study of Old Testament for one year college course (104 lessons). Questions are carefully formulated. **Sellin**—Second edition. **Swete**—This second reprint of the *Introduction* has been directed by Mr. Ottley who has brought the contents up to the present state of knowledge by a careful revision of the text and added footnotes together with expanded bibliographical lists which formerly were defective. **Wood** and **Grant**—A book adapted for college students. It excludes technicalities and aims to emphasize more particularly the literary merits of the Scriptures.

III. CANON, TEXT AND VERSIONS

ANTONIN, *Die Proverbien Salomos. Russ. Übersetzung aus dem hebräischen und griechischen Text. Beilage: Der slavische Text des Buches* [russ.], 3. Bd., St. Petersburg, 1914.

ARNDT, A., *Die Hl. Schrift des A. und N. T. Mit dem Urtexte der Vulgata*, Regensburg: Pustet, 1914, pp. xi+1020.

BARNES, G. E., ed., *Pentateuchus Syriace*, London: Br. Mus., 1914, pp. 398.

BROOKE, A. E., and MCLEAN, H., *The Old Testament in Greek*. Part IV, Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1917, pp. xxi+897.

BUCKLE, D. P., 'Bohairic Lections of wisdom from J. Rylands Library MS', *JTS*17, 78-98.

BUDGE, E. A. W., ed., *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, London: Br. Mus., 1915, pp. clxxiii+1216.

CHEIKHO, L., *Catalogue raisonné des MSS. historiques de la bibliothèque orientale de l'université St. Joseph* (Mélanges de la faculté orientale Beyrouth), Beyrouth: Université St. Joseph, 1914, pp. vi+213-304.

CLARK, A. C., *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism*, Oxford: Clarendon pr., 1914, pp. 28.

DARLOW, T. H., 'The Character of the Bible inferred from its Versions', *JTV*146, 87-97.

EHRLICH, A. B., *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, vii, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914, pp. 476.

EURINGER, S. V., 'Bemerkungen zur georgischen Übersetzung des Hohenliedes', *BZ*12, 97-116.

GALL, A. v., *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*. Parts I-III, Giessen: Töpelmann, 1914-1915, pp. lxx+112; 113-206; 207-264.

GASTER, M., 'A Codex of the Bible according to the Massora of Ben Neptali and the Oriental Tradition', *PSBA*, 1917, 73-84; 141-151; 172-183 (Continued).

GÖTTSCHE, J., 'Eine katholische hebräische Bibel', *BZ*12, 1-13.

GRIMME, H., 'Das älteste hebräische Manuskript', *BZ*12, 225-234.

HARRIS, R., and MINGANA, A., *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*. Vol. I, Manchester: Univ. Pr., 1916, pp. xi+45, pls. 56.

HERRMANN, J., *Unpunktirte Texte aus dem A. T. für akademische Übungen und zum Selbstunterrichte*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914, pp. 32.

HERZ, N., 'The Exaggeration of Errors in the Massoretic', *JTS*15, 258-264.

HETZENAUER, M., *Biblia sacra Vulgatae editionis Sixti V Pont. Max. iussu recognita et Clementis VIII auctoritate edita. Ex tribus editionibus Clementinis critice descripsit, dispositionibus et notis exegeticis illustravit, appendice lectionum hebraicarum et graecarum auxit*, Regensburg: Pustet, 1914, pp. xix+1280.

HOLMES, S., *Joshua. The Hebrew and Greek Texts*, Cambridge: Univ. Pr., pp. 88.

KILGOUR, R., 'Two Hebrew Bibles of Four Hundred Years Ago', *Exp.* 14, 48-57.

LODS, A., ed., *La Sainte Bible* (Gen. I : I-Ex. 9 : 16), Paris: Société Biblique de Paris, 1916.

LIETZMANN, H., *Ein Psalterfragment der Jenaer Papyrussammlung*, NTL Studien f. Heinrici, 1914, pp. 60-65, Tafel 1.

LINDELÖF, V., *Der Lambeth-Psalter. Eine altenglische Interlinearversion des Psalters in der Hs. 427 der erzbischöfl. Lambeth Palace Library. II. Beschreibung und Geschichte der Hs. Verhältnis der Glosse zu andern Psalterversionen. Bermerkungen über die Sprache des Denkmals*, Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1914, pp. iv+108.

MACLER, F., *Notices de manuscrits arméniens vus dans quelques bibliothèques de l'Europe centrale* (Jas. 11, S. II 229-284; 560-686), 1914.

MARGOLIS, M. L., ed., *The Holy Scriptures*, Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Soc., 1917, pp. xvi+1136.

MARGOLIS, M. L., 'Hexapla and Hexaplaric', AJSL, 1916, 126-140.

MINGANA, A., 'Syriac Versions of the Old Testament', JQR6, 385-398.

NAIRNE, A., 'Versions of Holy Scripture', CQR78, 406-435.

NAVILLE, E., *Text of the Old Testament*, London: H. Melford, 1917.

NISIUS, J. B., 'Schlussergebnisse der Forschung und Kontroverse über die Vulgata Sixtina', ZkTh38, 183-266.

OLMSTEAD, A. T., 'Source Study and the Biblical Text', AJSL30, 1-35.

PETERS, N., 'Eine kritische Ausgabe des hebräischen Pentateuchs der Samaritaner', BZ13, 97-105.

RAHLFS, A., *Verzeichnis der griechischen Hss. des A. T.*, 2. Bd. Göttingen: Weidmann, 1914, pp. xvi+444.

ROTHSTEIN, J. W., 'Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner', DL236, 125-134.

SANDERS, H. A., *The Washington MS of the Psalms. Part II*, New York: Macmillan, 1917, pp. 349, pls. iv-ix.

SCHAPIRO, I., 'The Hebrew Collection of the Library of Congress', JAOS36, 355-359.

SCHWAB, M., 'Manuscrits hébreux de la Bibliothèque Nationale', REj64, 290-296.

SCHWARZ, A. Z., *Die hebräischen Hss. der k. k. Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, Wien: Hölder, 1914, pp. 136, pl. I.

TRUYOLS, A. F., *Estudios de Critica Textual*, Rom: Pontif. Insti. Bibl., 1917.

VAN DER FLIER, A., 'Het profstuk van "la Bible du Centenaire" en de vereischten voor een volksvertaling van den Bibel', Theol. Studien, 32, 220-244.

WEIR, T. H., 'Some Fresh Notes on the Text of the Old Testament', Exp. 7, 472-480.

WELLER, A., *Die frühmittelhochdeutsche Wiener Genesis nach Quellen Übersetzung, Stil und Syntax* (Palaestra, cxxiii), Berlin: Mayer, 1914, pp. ix+259.

WORRELL, W. H., ed., *The Coptic Psalter in the Freer Collection*, New York: Macmillan, 1916, pp. xxvi+112, pls. vi.

Arndt—Sixth edition. **Barnes**—Edited without critical notes, but the best Syriac text at present. **Brooke** and **McLean**—This is Part IV of the new Cambridge edition of the Septuagint. The excellence of the former parts is well known. This part is in the same splendid style, with innumerable variant readings. **Buckle**—This Coptic MS, though modern (dated A. D. 1761), reproduces an ancient text of great interest. The

four lections contained in the Rylands MS are printed in this article. Suggestions are made concerning questions of text and interpretations recently raised. **Budge**'s edition contains many Old Testament references. **Cheikho** carefully describes 150 MSS. Of special interest are Nos. 18-20, History of Old and New Testaments, Nos. 63-64, Joseph ben Girion's *Geschichte der Juden*, Nos. 89-93, containing Moslem versions of the history of the Patriarchs and prophets. **Clark**—A study in the technique of textual criticism. **Darlow** says that inspiration is not effected by translation. The spiritual potency of the Biblical versions witnesses to inspiration. **Ehrlich** with this seventh volume has completed his monumental work. The series discusses in a philological way all the difficult and interesting passages in the MT, making many amendments and suggestions. **Euringer**—A critical examination, pointing out Greek and Armenian influence. **Gall**'s excellent folio edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch now includes Part I. Prologomena and Genesis; Part II. Exodus; Part III. Leviticus. It is printed in the Hebrew square character with variant readings in the footnotes and full textual apparatus. **Gaster** sketches the three principal stages through which the Massora has been developed during the ages. **Herz** cites examples to prove that the consonantal text is not so corrupt as is generally assumed. The errors are due to confusion of letters similar in sound and form, to wrong division of consonants, wrong pointing, dittography, reminiscence or dogmatic alteration. The criticism is unreliable. **Holmes** advocates strongly the superiority of the Greek. **Kilgour** gives a description of the Hebrew text contained in Cardinal Ximenes' Polyglot and The First Biblica Rabbinica published by Daniel Bomberg in 1517. **Lods**—The first installment of the French Protestant translation. Genesis is translated by Louis Aubert; Exodus by Henri Traband. **Lietzmann**—This fragment contains Psalms 22:6; 23:1f; 24:2-5. **Lindelöf** publishes the *Lambeth-Psalter* fully for the first time. **Macler**—This work includes many Biblical MSS. They are described according to content and form with register

of names and libraries. **Margolis**—A new translation, very scientifically performed, of the MT with the aid of previous versions and by consultation with Jewish authorities. The Books are arranged according to the order of the MT. The volume is indispensable to Old Testament students. In the *AJSL* he criticizes the apparatus employed in work upon the Septuagint. Even in the new Cambridge edition of Brooke and McLean not sufficient attention is paid to the Hexapla arrangement, especially the transposition in the fifth column. The use of all possible auxiliaries is urged to further this important work. **Mingana** aims to show the merits and defects of the Pshitto version. **Nairne's** article is a scholarly discussion upon the language of sacred literature, which is 'the product of the interaction of nature and art, contemporary speech and a simple literary instinct . . . at each stage it makes a new beginning in literature'. **Nisius** makes a serviceable collection of the successive problems in which the author has taken a lively interest. **Olmstead**—A study in the Greek text of Theodotion. **Rahlfs** has done a great work which comprises all known MSS of the Old Testament to the end of the sixteenth century, as well as simple Bible texts, Catena, commentaries (from the fifth century on), lexionaries, arranged alphabetically. **Rothstein** writes in relation to Gall's work on the Samaritan Pent. **Sanders**—This fifth century MS, written in large square 'Slavonic' uncials, is a good specimen of the early Christian Psalter. The MS with the fragment $\Lambda\alpha$, although fragmentary, covers the entire Psalter. **Schapiro** writes an appreciative description of the important collection of books in the Library of Congress covering all fields of Jewish learning from antiquity to the present day. **Schwab**—The collection includes Biblical MSS. **Schwarz**—Contains some Bible MSS and commentaries. **Van der Flier** discusses the new French Protestant translation of the Bible. **Weller**—Chapters 1 and 2 have already appeared (1912) as a dissertation. **Worrell**—This MS printed from an especially made type contains a large section of the Psalter. Was used in the early Church in Egypt.

The MS is sumptuously published, with an excellent critical introduction.

IV. HERMENEUTICS (GRAMMAR AND LEXICOGRAPHY)

BARTON, G. A., 'The Hermeneutic Canon "Interpret Historically" in the Light of Modern Research', *JBL*33, 56-77.

BAUDISSEN, W. W., 'Alttestamentliches *hayyim* "Leben" in der Bedeutung von "Glück"', (*Sachau Festschr.* 143-161).

BAUER, H., 'Die Herkunft des hebräischen יְהוָה', *Monde* or. 7, 241.

BAUER, H., 'Die "Tochter Zion,"' *Monde* or. 7, 240 f.

BAUER, H., 'Die hebräischer "Duale" עֲרָבִים and צָהָרִים', *OrLz*17, 7 f.

BAUER, H., 'Die Etymologie von Adam und Verwandtes', *ZA*28, 310 f.

BEER, G., 'Einige Bemerkungen zur hebräischen Grammatik', *ZATW*34, 54-57.

BEN YEHUDA, E., 'Three Notes in Hebrew Lexicography', *JAOS*37, 324-327.

BLAKE, F. R., 'The Expression of Indefinite Pronominal Ideas in Hebrew', *JAOS*34, 114-228.

BLUMBERG, J. D., *Das Hebräischsprechen nach talmudischen Quellen*, Jaffa, 1914, 31.

BUDDE, K., 'Wortlaut und Werden der ersten Schöpfungsgeschichte', *ZATW*35, 65-97.

BUHL, F., 'Die Bedeutung des Stammes לְזִין oder לִיְזִין im Hebräischen' (Wellh. *Festschr.* 243-263).

BURTON, E. D., 'Spirit, Soul and Flesh' (Part II. In the O. T.), *AJT*18, 59-80; (Part IV. In Jewish-Greek Lit.), *ib.*, 20, 390-413.

DAVIDSON, A. B., *Hebrew Grammar*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1916, pp. xiv+236.

DANZEL, T. W., *Die Anfänge der Schrift*, Leipzig: Voigländer, 1914, pp. x+219, pls. 40.

DOELLER, T., *Compendium Hermeneuticae biblicae*, Paderborn: Schöningh, 1914, pp. vii+169.

EBERHARTER, A., 'Die hebräischen Nomina auf יְ sprachgeschichtlich untersucht', *BZ*12, 337-352.

FRANCKH, R., 'Zur Bedeutung von מְלֹא', *ZATW*34, 232 f.

FRANKENBURG, W., 'Die Determination im Semitischen' (Wellh. *Festschr.* 129-144).

GAENSSLE, C., 'The Hebrew Particle רְשָׁא', I', *AJSL*, 1914, 3-66; 1915, 93-159.

GARDNER, W. R. W., 'Did Moses write the Pentateuch in Babylonian Cuneiform?' *ET*25, 526 ff.

GASTOR, M., 'The Grandson', *ET*28, 518-520.

GESENIUS, W., *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das A. T.*, Leipzig: Vogel, 1915, pp. xix+1013.

GRAY, G. B., 'Breach for Breach', *ET*26, 347-351.

HEHN, J., 'Zum Terminus "Bild Gottes"' (*Sachau Festschr.* 36-52).

HOLZBERG, K., *Übungsbuch zum Hebräischen*, Paderborn: Schöningh, 1914, pp. iii+41.

JASTROW, M., 'On מִתְחָרֶת הַשְׁבָּת ("The Day after the Sabbath")', AJSL, 1914, 94-110.

KAUTZSCH, E., *Übungsbuch zur hebräischen Grammatik*, Leipzig: Vogel, 1915, pp. 181.

KELSO, J. A., and CULLEY, D. E., *Hebrew-English Vocabulary to the Book of Genesis*, New York: Scribner's, 1917, pp. 48.

KLAEHN, T., *Die sprachl. Vorwandtschaft d. Quelle K der Samuelisbücher mit der Quelle J des Heptateuch*, Rostock: 1914.

KNUDTZON, J. A., 'Bemerkungen zur 28. Auflage der hebräischen Grammatik von Gesenius', ZATW, 1915, 196-217.

KÖHLER, L., 'Zum hebräischen Wörterbuch des Alten Testaments' (Wellh. *Festschr.* 243-263).

KÖNIG, E., 'Jöröb 'äm, oder Järöb 'äm?', ZATW34, 234 f.

LEANDER, P., 'Der Kampf zwischen Philippis Gesetz und dem Systemzwange in der hebräischen Sprachgeschichte', Monde or. 6, 185-192.

LEVIAS, C., *Wörterbuch der hebräischen philologischen Terminologie. I.*, Leipzig: Stechert, 1914, pp. xvi+160.

LICHTENBERG, R. v., 'Ursprung und Alter der Buchstabenschrift', Archi. f. Schriftkunde I, 1914-1915, 17-30.

LÖW, I., 'Lexikalische Miszellen' (*Festschrift Hoffmann*, 119-138).

MINGANA, A., 'Remarks on the Hebrew of Genesis', Exp. II, 303-310.

MITCHELL, H. G., 'הַיּוֹם of the past', JBL33, 48-55.

MONTET, E., 'Une thèse originale. L'AT a-t-il été écrit en hébreu?' *Revue hebraïque*, I, 145-147.

PRAETORIUS, F., 'Dagesh forte dirimens', ZATW34, 233 f.

REIDER, J., *Prologomena to a Greek-Hebrew Index to Aquila*, Philadelphia: 1916, pp. 160.

SACHSSE, E., 'Die Etymologie und älteste Aussprache des Namens יִשְׂרָאֵל', ZATW 34, 1-15.

SCHICK, G. V., 'The Stems dûm and damám in Hebrew', JBL32, 219-243.

SCHODDE, G. H., *Outlines of Biblical Hermeneutics*, 1917.

SCHLÖGL, N., 'יְהֹוָה, אֱלֹהִים, אֱלֹהָיִם', BZ13, 106-113.

SCHWALLY, F., 'Zum hebräischen Nominalsat', ZDMG68, 111-117.

SEWELL, E. J., 'The Principle Governing Bible Translation', JTVI48, 43-64.

SLOUSCH, N., 'Une thèse symptomatique', *Revue hébraïque*, I, 148-151.

VERNES, M., *Les emprunts de la bible hébraïque au grec et au latin*, Paris: Leroux, 1914, pp. iv+256.

VOSEN, C. H., u. KAULEN, F., *Kurze Anleitung zum Erlernen der hebräischen Sprache*, Freiburg: Herder, 1914, pp. xiii+183.

WATERMAN, L., 'A Half-Century of Biblical and Semitic Investigation', AJSL, 1916, 219-229.

Barton emphasizes the necessity of historical interpretation, that the Bible may take its rightful place in modern life. Baudisson—*Hayyim* means life as power and also as a condi-

tion; in later literature it is used as luck. **Bauer**—The 'daughter' is a dialectical change of 'house' of Zion. Endings **תָּ** and **תִּ** represent dialectical variations. Used in a conditional sentence, **עִנָּה**, from **נָהַ**, has the meaning of 'to have'.

Ben Yehuda—Psalms 75:9; Song of Songs 7:6; Nahum 2:14. **Blake**—'An exemplification of the employment of a principle of syntactical study'—the so-called logical method from the standpoint of the idea or grammatical category.

Gives valuable statistics for further investigation. **Budde** makes a careful study to determine the exact nature of the text. The foundation of Genesis I is derived from J². **Buhl** seeks to show that **לִ**= to be bold, impudent. **Burton** makes

a valuable, critical and historical study. The new edition of **Davidson's** grammar, the twentieth, appears a little more than a year after that of 1914. Not a mere reprint, but the book has been entirely reset, with practically every paragraph renumbered. Many new examples have been added to illustrate the rules. **Doeller**—This third edition can be recommended as a practical manual for this discipline as it adheres to a mean between voluminous works and too scanty outlines. **Franckh**—Derived from **עַלְמָ**. The mysteries connected with puberty suggest a stage of life whose dawn is shrouded with mystery.

Frankenberg takes the same position as in his treatise *Der Organismus der semitischen Wortbildung*, 1913. **Gaenssele** maintains the thesis that **אֲשֶׁר** must be located among the substantives. "אֲשֶׁר is not an original demonstrative, but an original noun of place." **Gardner** combats Naville's hypothesis.

Gaster—The repetition of **בְּ** **בְּ** served to show a lacuna in the genealogy. **Gesenius**—Sixteenth edition by F. Buhl. **Gray** discusses critically the meaning of the phrase. **Hehn** starts with II Corinthians 4:4 and follows the occurrence of the figure in Babylonian and Assyrian literature and in the Old Testament; finding that man, priest and king were often spoken of as a likeness of God. **Holzhey**—Progressive exercises in Hebrew-German and German-Hebrew, supplemented with a

brief lexicon. A very practical book of its kind. **Jastrow**—**תְּבָשָׁ** = the period of the full moon; **תְּנִתְנָשָׁ** = another day on which Rites were celebrated similar to those of the full moon. **Kautzsch**'s exercise-book is brought up to date in this seventh edition by Dr. Kramer. **Kelso** and **Culley**—This little book is to supply a need in the teaching of Hebrew. Based upon an independent study of the Hebrew text. **Klaehn**—A dissertation. **Köhler**—A series of twenty questionable emendations, only five or six of which are reliable. **König** sticks to his reading of *Jöröb'ām* in reply to Nestle. **Leander** treats especially of the transmutation of *i* into *ä*. **Lichtenberg** advocates the European-Aryan alphabet as antedating all other writing. **Löw** supplies numerous definitions from Midrash, Talmud and Bible. **Mingana** seeks to show some traits which betray the current of Aramaean hegemony. **Mitchell** would translate **וְהִי** "and it came to pass" when followed by a verb of repetition or continuation. **Montet** *versus* Naville. **Prætorius**—Due chiefly to faulty typography. **Reider**—A Ph.D. thesis intended to supplement Hatch-Redpath in the Oxford Concordance to the LXX. **Sachsse** holds that the original pronunciation of the name of Israel down to the time of Hosea was *Ye(š)arel* and not *Yisrael*. This meant "God is righteous." **Schwally** studies the time element in these sentences. Maintains that the same law in Arabic and Syriac obtains in Hebrew. **Sewell** thinks that the thought and not the words should be translated. **Slousch** *versus* Naville. **Vernes** is Quixotic and inexact. **Vosen** and **Kaulen**'s useful handbook for elementary instruction reaches its twentieth and twenty-first edition, J. Schumacher, editor. **Waterman** reviews past progress and calls for still greater effort in the future. The languages of the Old Testament await a more rapid and efficient means of mastery.

V. GEOGRAPHY

BECKER, F., u. DALMAN, G., *Karte von Jerusalem und Mittel-Judäa für Palästina-reisende und Bibelleser*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914 (?).
 BIRCH, W. F., 'The Site of Gibeah', PEF46, 42-44.

BURNEY, C. F., 'The Topography of Gideon's Rout of the Midianites' (Wellh. *Festschr.* 89-99).

COVEY-CRUMP, W. W., 'The Situation of Tarshish', *JTS*17, 280-290.

DIETRICH, A., *Die Mutter Erde*, Leipzig: Teubner, 1914, pp. 138.

FISCHER, H., 'Referat über die moderne Topographie, Siedlungs- und Verkehrsgeographie Palästinas für Jahre 1910-1912', *ZDPV*36, 136-154; 211-219.

HÄNSLER, H., 'Streiflichter in die Topographie des alten Jerusalem', *Das heilige Land*, 58, 1-13; 80-106; 130-142.

HILDESHEIMER, A., 'Beitrag zur Erklärung einiger geographischer Bibelstellen' (*Festschrift Hoffmann*, 1-25).

HILL, J. G., 'The Dead Sea', *PEF*46, 23-29.

ISAACS, S. H., *The True Boundaries of the Holy Land*, Chicago: Private Edition, 1917.

Karte des Ostjordanlandes (Deut. Vereins zur Erforsch. Palästinas, Blatt A.).

KLAMETH, G., *Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte biblischer Lokaltraditionen Palästinas*, Progr.: Maehrisch-Ostrau, 1914, pp. 9.

KLEIN, H., 'Das Klima Palästinas auf Grund der alten hebräischen Quellen' *ZDPV*37, 297-327.

MÖLLER, H., 'Die Lage von Gibeon-Benjamin', *ZDPV*38, 49-53.

NICHOLLS, S. M., *Scenic Studies of the Bible Background*, London: Longmans, 1914.

RIESSLER, P., 'Zur Geographie der Jubiläen und der Genesis', *TQ*96, 341-367.

SCHURÉ, E., *Die Heiligtümer des Orients*, Leipzig: Altmann, 1915, pp. xv+312.

SCHWÖBEL, V., *Die Landesnatur Palästinas*, I. Teil, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915, pp. 52.

SMITH, G. A., *Atlas of the Holy Land*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1915, pp. xxxvi+60.

STERNBERG, G., 'Studien aus den deutschen evang. Institut für Altertumswissenschaften in Jerusalem. 27. Bethel. Mit Kartenskizze', *ZPV*38, 1-40.

THOMSEN, P., 'Bericht über Geographie und Topographie des alten Palästina für 1910-1913', *ZPV*38, 182-203.

WANDEL, 'Jerusalem und die Davidsburg', *St. Kr.*, 1914, 309-346.

WILD, L. H., *Geographic Influences in Old Testament Masterpieces*, Boston: Ginn & Co., 1915, pp. xiii+183.

Becker and Dalman—Very instructive but not wholly successful in its aim. **Birch** believes the site of Gibeah to be found at Ch. Adasch. **Burney** tries to determine with certainty the course taken by the fleeing Midianites. **Covey-Crump** suggests as the probable location of Tarshish Sicily (at first) and Sardinia (later on) whence the Tyrian traders obtained metals in Solomon's day. **Dietrich**—Second edition. **Hildesheimer** treats of the northern portion east of the Jordan, belonging to Half-Manasses. Takes an anti-critical position in regard to the

extent of חבל ארץ. Isaacs discusses the geography of Numbers 34:1-12 with practical purposes in mind. Klein makes a careful study of the Sources. Möller identifies Gibea-Benjamin with *tell el-fül*. Nicholls—A guide to the series of wall pictures to which the maps and descriptions refer. Planned for school use and will undoubtedly serve a useful purpose. Riessler translates Jub. 8:11-9; 10:28-36 and reconstructs out of this the cosmogony of the author, with full geographical and exegetical notes. Jub. has with Genesis a common source. Paradise is located in Southwestern Arabia. Schuré—A section on Palestine. Schwöbel wrote an introduction to a new series of works on Palestine, 1914. This is second edition. Smith's fine folio volume on the *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* was prepared under the direction of J. G. Bartholomew. Includes the general features of the world, physical and political, and the empires between which the land was placed; (2) the physical and economic geography of the land itself; (4) a succession of maps of the political geography, some illustrations of the conceptions of the land at former periods of history; (5) a series of 'Notes to the Maps'. Sternberg—"Bethel = bētēn das heutige Palästina ist." Identified with the sacrificial place which Josiah destroyed (IV Kings 23:15 ff.). The center of the Abraham and Jacob cult. Thomsen is a positive authority in this field. Wandel—The locations are in general traditional without successfully removing the difficulties. Wild shows most successfully how Old Testament literature should be interpreted through the geography, history, botany and zoology of the land.

VI. HISTORY. a. GENERAL

BEREZKIN, D. M., *Biblejskaja Flora*, St. Petersburg, pp. viii+174.
 BREASTED, J. H., *Ancient Times. A History of the Early World*, Boston: Ginn & Co., 1916, pp. xx+742.
 BUMÜLLER, J., *Die Urzeit des Menschen*, Köln: Bachem, 1914, pp. iv+307.
 COLUNGA, A., 'Yo soy Jahweh, tu Dios, que te saqué de la tierra de Egipto', *La Ciencia Tomista*, 1915, Mai-Juni.
 DICKIE, A. C., 'The Jews as Builders', JMEOS, 1914, 57-65.
 EGEN, K., 'Die Zahl 9 in der Heiligen Schrift', ThPQ68, 452 f.

EISSFELDT, O., *Israels Geschichte*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1914, pp. 52.

EISSFELDT, O., *Krieg und Bibel*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1915, pp. 84.

FISCHER, O. V., 'Chronologische Studien zum Alten Testament', ZAW34, 45-53.

FOAKES-JACKSON, F. J., *The Biblical History of the Hebrews*, Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 1917, pp. xxxii+440.

GUTHÉ, H., *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1914, pp. xvi+373, illus. 5, mps. 4.

HAUPT, P., 'Alcohol in the Bible', JBL36, 75-83.

HÄNSLER, H., 'Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte Palästinas', Das heilige Land, 58, 65-78; 149-162.

HILL, H. W., 'Modern Leprosy and Biblical Tsaarath', Am. Jr. Public Health, 1914.

MENZINGER, O., 'Über die Urgeschichte des Menschen, IV', ThprMS25, 249-255.

PASIG, P., 'Der Tanz und die Bibel' (Stud. 12, 361-366).

PATTON, W. M., *Israel's Account of Beginnings*, Boston: Pilgrim Pr., 1916, pp. xii+173.

PERITZ, I. J., *Old Testament History*, New York: Abingdon Pr., 1915, pp. 336.

SANDERS, F. K., *History of the Hebrews*, New York: Scribner's, 1914, pp. xiii+367.

SITZBERGER, 'Der Ursprung des Menschen', ThprMS25, 361-371.

SOARES, T. G., *The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible*, New York: Abingdon Pr., 1915, pp. 385.

STAINER, J., *The Music of the Bible*, London: Novello & Co., 1914, pp. viii+230.

TAGLICHT, J., 'Die Erinnerung an "Ägypten"' (In *Festschrift Maybaum*).

WELLHAUSEN, J., *Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, Berlin: Reimer, 1914, pp. 371.

WHITING, J. D., 'Jerusalem's Locust Plague', NGM28, 511-550.

WILD, L. H., *The Evolution of the Hebrew People and Their Influence on Civilization*, New York: Scribner's, 1917, pp. xi+311.

Berezkin studies the Biblical flora. **Breasted** aims to present, primarily for first-year high school, in a realistic manner by means of elaborate illustration, the entire field of ancient history down to the end of the Roman Empire. The chapter on the Hebrews (pp. 197-217) is a brief but well-stated summary of the field. The book is provided with a complete system of maps. **Bumüller**—Third edition much improved. **Dickie** maintains the "building greatness in the Old Testament indicates a pride out of all actuality." There was no development of a national style of architecture. **Eissfeldt** writes a practical Bible history for the general reader. He also treats of the wars of early Israel as the wars of Jehovah. The list of wars is arranged chronologically. **Foakes-Jackson**—The second edition of this excellent textbook is substantially unchanged save

for the correction of some manifest errors and a few additions to the notes and an addition to the appendix containing translations of the important inscriptions relating to Israel. **Guthe**—Third enlarged edition, much improved. **Haupt** interprets a number of passages to show the strongly alcoholic character of the Hebrew wines. **Hill** contends that *Lepra* is not the modern leprosy. **Menzinger** makes a dogmatic estimate of the problem: the evolution of body and soul is heretical. **Pasig** gives the meaning of dancing in the Old Testament. **Patton's** book is a good scholarly textbook. The "volume is designed to be the first instalment of a series covering the history of Israel's life and literature to the year 79 A. D." **Peritz** offers a useful handbook for a systematic study of Old Testament history, beginning with the pre-Patriarchal period. **Sanders**—A useful textbook, systematically and scientifically written. **Sitzberger** treats the question in a purely scientific manner and concludes that bodily descent from animals is unproven—to say nothing of the soul. **Soares** points out how religion enters the social life of a people and relates itself to their institutions. This new illustrated edition of **Stainer's** book was originally an article in Cassel's *Bible Educator*. The supplementary work was done by F. W. Galpin. **Wellhausen**—The seventh edition, brought up to date, of this famous book. **Whiting** describes in an interesting way with beautiful illustrations the recent locust influx into Palestine and compares this with ancient Old Testament accounts. **Wild's** textbook is adapted for beginners. It pursues an evolutionary method and aims to place the history of the Hebrews in the current of the world's life, both as regards origins and effects.

VI. b. HEBREW

ARNOLD, W. R., *Ephod and Ark.*, Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Pr., 1917, pp. 170.
 CARROLL, B. H., *Hebrew Monarchy*, Revell, 1916.
 CASPARI, W., *Tronbesteigungen und Tronfolge der israelitischen Könige*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1917, pp. 143-254.
 DÄCHSEL, G. A., *Treuverhältnisse im A. T. Eine biblisch-rechtliche Studie*, Breslau, pp. 62.

DESNOYERS, L., 'Le règne de Josias, roi de Juda, 637-607 B. C.', BLe, 1914, 257-280; 308-325.

EBERHARTER, A., *Das Ehe- und Familienrecht der Hebräer*, Münster: Aschendorff, 1914, pp. x+205.

GRAY, G. B., 'A Group of Hebrew Names of the Ninth Century B. C.', ET27, 57-62.

HOLZINGER, H., 'Ehe und Frau im vordeuteronomischen Israel' (Wellh. *Fest-schr.* 227-243).

JASTROW, *Hebrew and Babylon Tradition*, New York: Scribner's 1914, pp. 376.

JONES, E., *Israel's Sabbatical Chronology*, London: Roberts, 1915, pp. 144.

KENT, C. F., and JENKS, J. W., *The Testing of a Nation's Ideals*, New York: Scribner's, 1915, pp. vii+149.

MENZ, E., *Die Blutrache bei den Israeliten*, pp. iv+137.

MONTGOMERY, J. A., 'Brief Communications. I. Tartak', JBL33, 78.

MOTZO, B., 'La sorte dei Giudei in Egitto al tempo di Geremias', Riv. d. stud. or. 6, 353-363.

SCHELLHORN, M., 'Die Ehen der Israeliten mit den Volksfremden', ThprMS25, 83-98.

SMITH, J. M. P., 'Some Problems in the Early History of Hebrew Religion', AJSL, 1915, 81-97.

SULZBERGER, J. M., 'The Ancient Hebrew Law of Homicide I', JqR5, 127-161.

WASSINK, D. K., 'Het volkslied by Israël (Geloof en Vrijheid, 1914, 333-364).

Arnold—An interesting study in the records of the ancient Hebrews to determine the character of the Ephod and Ark. Seeks to prove, with a fair amount of success, that the word **תְּרוּם**, meaning a solid object, has been substituted for the word **לִרְאָה**. The ark itself was used for divining. **Caspari**—The Israelite kingdom was a natural growth, not a development of the priesthood; influenced by Canaanite forms, but essentially indigenous. The dynastic idea arose early but freedom of succession within the dynasty was not uncommon. **Dächsel** publishes only Part I, covering the legal relations between king and subjects, lord and vassal. Part II will cover that between Yahweh and the Israelites as subjects and as vassals. **Eberharter** defends the traditional view of the marriage institution. **Gray**—The Ba'al names in actual Hebrew life were not so frequent as some scholars have thought. **Holzinger** has done good work toward clearing up the problem of bride-purchase in Israel. **Jastrow's** Haskell Lectures delivered at Oberlin in 1913 have since been revised and enlarged. **Kent and Jenks's**

account of Israel's history from the Settlement to the Assyrian period is planned primarily to meet the needs of college students. The books aim also to carry a message to modern life. **Montgomery**—In IV Kings 17 תְּרַתְּנָהָרָתְּ Atargatis. **Motzo** refers to the persecution in Egypt when Amasis victoriously mounted the throne. **Shellhorn** makes a historical survey of the content of this law from pre-Mosaic times down to Ezra, and its observance. **Smith** makes some interesting comments concerning the date of the Hebrew settlement in Canaan, which are important for the dating of the literature and laws of early Israel. **Sulzberger**—With Solomon began a struggle to enforce the law of the covenant in contradistinction to Canaanite custom, which succeeded after a hundred years.

VI. C. JEWISH

BRÜNE, B., *Flavius Josephus und seine Schriften*, 1914, pp. vii + 308.
 FOCKE, F., *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos*, 1914, pp. vii + 132.
 GRAY, G. B., 'The Title "King of Persia,"' ET25, 245-251.
 HOBERG, G., 'Die Zeit von Esdras und Nehemias' (*Festschr. Hertling*, 36-40).
 RAMSAY, W. M., 'The Old Testament in Roman Phrygia', ET26, 168-174.
 ROTH, O., *Rom und die Hasmonäer*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914, pp. 88.
 TOUZARD, J., 'Les Juifs au temps de la période Persane', RB, 1915, 59-133.
 WINDISCH, H., 'Der Untergang Jerusalems (anno 70) im Urteil der Christen und Juden', ThT, 1914, 519-550.

Focke—A study in the history of Jewish Hellenism. **Gray** sketches the history of the title and discusses this in relation to Ezra-Nehemiah. **Hoberg** on the ground of Sachau's published Papyri places the time of Ezra and Nehemiah in the reign of Artaxerxes I. **Ramsay** makes some valuable contributions to the position, numbers and influence of the Jews in Roman Phrygia. **Roth** investigates Jewish and Roman political relations as seen in I Macc. and Josephus' Antiquities XIV. **Touzard**—A critical study of Ezra-Nehemiah, with a running criticism of Dr. Batten.

(*To be continued*)

CRITICAL NOTE

A MARONITE MISSAL

By ROBERT F. LAU, Bayonne, N. J.

In the year 1910 (perhaps earlier, for the exact date of purchase is not ascertainable) there came into the possession of the library of the General Theological Seminary in New York a manuscript Maronite Missal which had once been in the collection of Frederick Sneyd. So far as the writer knows, no description of this volume has ever been published; he therefore offers the following notes, with a translation of some of the more important passages, in the hope that this missal will attract the attention which it clearly deserves.

The title page, which is in Latin and Syriac, reads: MIS-SALE / SYRIACUM / juxta ritum / ECCLESIAE / ANTIOCHENAE / NATIONIS MARONITAR / Manu exaratum a Gabriele Maspani Damasceno / ROMAE ANNO MDCCXLII

כתב דקורבנא איך עידא דעתה אנטיקיתא דמרוני דכתיב לקשישא
מייחלא נבריאל מסכנייא:¹

The book is a folio, bound in tooled black morocco, with gilt edges, some of the leaves being furnished with little strips of vellum to facilitate turning the pages. It is in perfect condition; only the candle drippings on page after page, and the worn bits of vellum, testify to its long service on the altar. The leaves are of unusually heavy paper, watermarked with a single fleur-de-lis. The writing has been done with great care; the rubrics and the line bordering each page are in red, the text of the liturgy in black. The language is, for the greater part, Syriac; but as Arabic is the vernacular of the Maronites we are not surprised to find that many of the formulae which

¹ On account of lack of Syriac type I have been obliged to present transliterations in the Hebrew square character.

are said *teloitho* are given in parallel columns of Syriac and Carshuni. Because of the circumstance that few of the Maronite priests were well-versed in their ecclesiastical language, the text is fully vocalized, although, in the present instance, the rubrics are in unpointed Syriac, instead of the more customary Carshuni.

We have in this book a complete liturgy. There is a typical Syrian service of preparation, with the prayers to be said by the priest while vesting, a collection of proper *sedros*, the lections, and a general intercession—quite like the Syrian Jacobite form familiar to us from Brightman's *Liturgies Eastern and Western*.² At the end of the service there is a section containing 'Some Lections from the Apostle Paul' and 'The Year's Lections from the Holy Gospels'. A final note, witnessing to the accuracy of the copyist, attracts our attention because it contains the signatures of two of the Assemani: "Concordat cum originali Romae typis sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Anno 1716 impresso. In quor. &c hac die 28 Augusti 1742."

Stephanus Euodius Archiep[iscus] Apamee

Joseph. Simonius Assemanus, Biblioth[ecae] Vat[ican]e Pref[ectus]

Brightman lists only one Roman edition of 1716, the title of which differs, both in Latin and in Syriac, from the one here discussed, and the rubrics of which are in Carshuni.³

Our interest, however, centers on the anaphoras of this missal. The first is called 'The Anaphora of the Twelve Holy Apostles'⁴ קדושים עשר בERYת. Comparison with the 'Liturgia Duodecim Apostolorum' in Renaudot⁵ and with 'The Anaphora of the Twelve' in Howard,⁶ discloses a not inconsiderable number of variants. Such differences are to be expected: "Mira est Codicum hujus Liturgiae diversitas."⁷

² Vol. I, pp. 69-110.

³ *ib.*, p. lvii.

⁴ *ib.*, p. lviii.

⁵ *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio*, Paris 1716, t. ii, 170-174.

⁶ *The Christians of St. Thomas and Their Liturgies*, Oxford and London, 1864.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, t. ii, 175.

Renaudot, the first translator of Syriac liturgies, referred this 'diversity' to Roman interpolations and alterations;⁸ Assemanus (J. A.) scathingly resented the charge (thirty years after the accuser's death), explaining the differences as unimportant local variations.⁹ While it is true, as Labourt points out, that "useless and often servile adaptation to Roman usages characterizes the Maronite among Oriental rites,"¹⁰ the translations which follow show that Rome played no passive part, her activity being especially directed against liturgical evidences of the Eastern doctrine of the consecration of the Eucharist.

In the first place, the Invocation of the Holy Spirit as given in this part of the missal, while sufficiently direct and explicit in the prayer "Have mercy upon us," suffers a startling change at the point where the priest makes the sign of the cross over the host and the chalice.

Then the priest invokes the Holy Spirit, bowing down. Have mercy upon us, O Lord, and send down upon us from Thy holy heaven Thy holy, life-giving Spirit, that He may brood over this sacrifice and make it to be the life-giving Body, and that it may be to us for expiation, purification, and sanctification. And he genuflects, and says aloud, Hear me, O Lord; hear me, O Lord; hear me, O Lord: and send, O Lord, Thy living Holy Spirit to rest upon me and upon this sacrifice.

People. Kiria elison. kir kir

The priest makes the sign over the Body three times. And this mystery \bigtimes the Body \bigtimes of Christ \bigtimes our God make to be for our salvation. People. Amen.

The priest makes the sign over the chalice three times. And this chalice \bigtimes the blood \bigtimes of Christ \bigtimes our God make to be for our salvation. People. Amen.

Teloitho. So that these holy and life-giving mysteries may be to us for the remission of debts, for the forgiveness of sins,

⁸ *ib.*

⁹ *Codex Liturgicus: Ecclesiae Universae, Romae 1752, lib. iv, pars ii, Praefatio.*

¹⁰ *Arti. 'Maronites', Catholic Encyclopaedia.*

and for health of body and soul, and for the strengthening of our minds. Let not a single one of Thy faithful people perish; but count as all worthy, that, during life being led by Thy Spirit in purity, we may raise to Thee and to Thine only-begotten Son and to Thy Holy Spirit glory and praise, now and ever, world without end. *People.* Amen.

This, to put it mildly, looks strange to one familiar with Eastern liturgies. The suspicion is verified when we turn to the form of Invocation known to Abbé Renaudot: "Ut per illapsum suum faciat panem istum, corpus Christi Dei nostri. Et mistum, quod in hoc calice est, sanguinem Christi Dei nostri." ¹¹ And Howard ¹² read the same in his Travancore MS.

Still more was accomplished in a different way. In view of the fact that Syrian missals commonly contain several anaphoras, the Roman authorities generously inserted a second one into this altar book, without ordering or even suggesting its use. To judge by its title it is a well-known Western rite: "The Anaphora according to the Rite of the Holy Catholic Church of Rome, the Mother of All Churches"

אנאפורה לפות טכנא דעתה קדישה קתוליקית דרhomia אמא
דבלחין עדתא:

We turn the pages to see how the translator expressed in Syriac that form whose obscurity Innocent III exalted in so delightful and naïve a manner.¹³ In vain; there is nothing in this anaphora to correspond with the 'Suplices te rogamus'. As a matter of fact, the title is rather misleading.

THE ANAPHORA ACCORDING TO THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH
OF ROME, THE MOTHER OF ALL CHURCHES

The prayer before the Peace, teloitho,

Our Lord Jesus Christ, who didst say to Thine apostles, Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; regard us with

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, tom. ii, 172.

¹² *Op. cit.*

¹³ "Tantac sunt profunditatis haec verba, ut nulla acies humani ingenii tanta sit, ut ea penetrare possit."—*De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, lib. v, cap. v.

Thine approval, and grant us Thy tranquillity and Thy peace; that we may raise to Thee glory and praise, now and ever world without end. *People.* Amen.

The deacon. In the midst—¹⁴

The priest. O Lord God of Hosts, who out of the abundance—

Teloitho. We praise Thee, O Lord, and we implore Thee, in pity grant us Thy peace, that we may be delivered from the evil one; and that we may raise to Thee glory and praise, now and ever, world without end. *People.* Amen.

Teloitho. Receive our sacrifices, O Lord, and dispose our days in Thy peace, and from everlasting destruction deliver us, and number us with Thy chosen flock; and we shall raise to Thee glory and praise, now and ever, world without end. *People.* Amen.

The deacon. Give the Peace.

The priest. The love—
Upwards—

Let us give thanks unto the Lord with fear—
According to the ritual.

The priest, gehontho. It is very meet and right to give thanks to Thee at all times, O Lord God omnipotent. *Teloitho.* While angels are praising Thee, O Lord of Hosts, and Dominions are adoring Thee, and Powers are lauding Thee, and Heaven and the Hosts of Heaven and the blessed Seraphim are extolling Thee, with one accord, deem us worthy to cry aloud with them, as supplicants, and worthily to say

People. Holy, Holy, Holy art Thou—

Gehontho. Holy art Thou X God X the X Father, who didst send for our salvation thy beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. *He takes the host and raises his voice.* Who on the day before His passion took bread into His holy hands and lifted up His eyes to Thee, O God His omnipotent Father; and having given thanks to Thee He blessed X and X sanctified X and

¹⁴ The sign (—) indicates that the original gives these words only, as a cue to the full form.

broke and gave to His disciples, saying, Take, eat of it all of you

FOR THIS IS MY BODY

People. Amen.

The priest places the Body on the paten, genuflects, takes the chalice and raises his voice. In like manner also after supper He took into His pure hands this pure chalice; and having given thanks to Thee He blessed \bigtimes and \bigtimes sanctified \bigtimes and gave to His disciples, saying, Take, drink of it all of you

FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW COVENANT WHICH IS ETERNAL, THE MYSTERY WHICH IS OF FAITH, WHICH FOR YOU AND FOR MANY IS BEING SHED FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.

People. Amen.

The priest sets the chalice in its place and covers it with the small Annaphura, genuflects, and says: As often as ye do these things do them in remembrance of Me, until I come.

People. Thy death, O Lord—and the rest.

Teloitho. Remembering, O Lord, Thy saving passion, Thy resurrection from the house of the dead, and Thy glorious ascension into heaven, Thy Church offers to Thee this sacrifice, pure and holy, saying:

People. Have mercy upon us.

The priest, gehontho.

And we also—

More especially—

The Mother of our Lord—

According to the ritual.

Gehontho. Have mercy upon us, O Lord, and send upon us the holy, life-giving Spirit. *He genuflects and says, teloitho,* Hear me, O Lord.

People. Kir—

The priest. And this mystery the \bigtimes Body of \bigtimes Christ \bigtimes our God make to be for our salvation. *People.* Amen.

The priest. And this chalice the \bigtimes Blood of \bigtimes Christ \bigtimes our God make to be for our salvation. *People.* Amen.

Teloitho. Yea, we pray Thee, O Lord God, through these holy mysteries may we in this world partake of Thy goodness, and in the world to come grant us Thy kingdom; that we may raise to Thee glory and praise, now and ever, world without end. *People.* Amen. *The rest according to the Anaphora of the Twelve.*

This form contains the prayer 'Domine Jesu Christe qui dixisti apostolis tuis, which precedes the Pax in the Roman rite, also 'Hanc igitur oblationem' and 'Da propitius pacem': while these collects are not superior to those which they replace, they are certainly very appropriate in this position. The Peace is given exactly as it is found in the Anaphora of the Twelve, to which the cue words in the Anaphora of Rome refer. The Preface, on the other hand, is Roman. The Narrative of the Institution is, in rubric and in text, practically that which we find in the first anaphora, there being one or two unimportant points of divergence. But note what was done to the Epiklesis: The rubric '*Then the priest invokes the Holy Spirit, bowing down*' becomes '*Gehontho*', which is equivalent to 'secreto'. The Invocation which follows suffers a complete change in form and meaning. The words 'Hear me, O Lord' are perhaps a cue; but there is nothing to indicate that the full form is to be supplied by the priest. Even the final prayer has to go, probably in order to lessen the number of references to the Holy Spirit in this, to the Orientals, most solemn moment of the mystery. Was this anaphora inserted for the sole purpose of initiating the Maronites into the use of a rite which lacked a proper Epiklesis,¹⁵ or also in order to give them the impression that 'The Anaphora of Rome' did not differ very much from that ascribed to the twelve Apostles? However that may be, one oriental tradition was carefully respected: in both canons the

¹⁵ For an interesting defense of an obviously weakened Invocation in an Anaphora of St. James, cf. 'S. Joannis Maronis Expositio Oblationis', in Assemanus, *op. cit.*, lib. iv, pars ii, 362. This was first translated and published by Assemanus. Its authenticity is open to question; cf. Brightman, *op. cit.*, p. lxii.

Words of Institution are ordered to be recited in a loud voice.¹⁶

This attempt at trying to destroy an essential characteristic of a rite more primitive than the Roman is beyond doubt only one of many.¹⁷ It is to be hoped that some liturgical scholar will study and publish the various Romanized anaphoras, and show how persistent has been this attack on the Epiklesis. The writer offers this article as a slight contribution on the subject.

[Those who are interested in the ornamentation of ancient service books will find, at the end of the Roman Anaphora in this missal, a well-executed drawing of Veronica's veil, rather different from the traditional type. The upper corners of the veil are gathered in a graceful knot. The face of our Lord, unmarked by trace of suffering, was evidently drawn by a hand which lingered lovingly over its task. The materials used were the red ink of the rubrics, probably the fine pen with which the priest-scribe wrote the vowels of the text, and a small brush for the shading.]

¹⁶ Cf. Maskell, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England*, third edition, Oxford, 1882, note on p. 135.

¹⁷ Cf. Brightman, *Op. cit.*, p. lviii, note on MS. Brit. Mus. Syr. 10042; also p. lxxii f., note on mutilation of the Invocation in a Latin translation of an Abyssinian liturgy; and, p. xci, on the Byzantine liturgy with a Roman canon, probably used in Basilian communities in Italy and Sicily.

REVIEWS

The Rise of the Christian Religion: a Study in Origins. By CHARLES FREDERICK NOLLOTH, M. A., D. LITT., Oriel College, Oxford. Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Rochester. Macmillan, London, 1917, pp. xii + 608. \$4.00.

The present work is in a way the sequel to the author's earlier book, *The Person of our Lord and Recent Thought* (1908). We are therefore already familiar with Dr. Nolloth's method, although the present work is vastly the more elaborate of the two. He has not indeed undertaken to present within the compass of a single volume a fully detailed treatment of the history of primitive Christianity. Such an undertaking almost invariably requires two volumes or more. What he has done is, in his own words, to "outline the rise and early fortunes of the religion of Christ." Rather than produce another 'Life of Christ', or 'Apostolic Age', he has aimed "to deal with certain movements of thought which are central for any clear understanding of early Christianity, and to emphasize events that form epochs in its history" (Preface). This should be clearly recognized. The book is really a series of masterly apologetic essays on the leading elements of the history of early Christianity. It is not a connected history, but offers us the *prolegomena* to such a history. A brief survey of the chapter-headings alone is sufficient to indicate this: The Sources (Jewish, Pagan, Christian); the Preparation (Judaism, Dispersion, Philo, Greek Thought and Religion, Roman Religion); Miracles and History; the Birth of Christ; His Childhood; the Two Natures; the Forerunner; Jewish Sects and Parties; Temple and Priesthood; Public Ministry; the Purpose and Method of Christ; the Apostolate; Death of Christ; the Resurrection; Ascension; Pentecost; the Apostolic Church; Sacraments; Doctrine (St. Peter, St. Paul; Pauline Influence: St. John); Early Christianity and Ethics; the Close of the Apostolic Age. This

brief survey of the contents also indicates the character of the work, as chiefly a discussion of the primary and fundamental elements which go to make up the history and enter into its record, rather than an objective, descriptive presentation of the phenomena and development of primitive Christianity.

With the author's apologetic purpose, surely no one can have any quarrel. The historian of religion is certainly within his rights in treating the subject religiously, and as a believer. It is absurd that such a claim should need to be made today, but there are still a few persons who assume that positive and wholehearted faith is an obstacle to the scientific consideration of religious history. We may question the author's method on more than one occasion in the work; but his purpose throughout is clear enough and should be constantly borne in mind. The work is very finely tempered. Fair treatment is given even to the most radical views. This is especially noticeable also in the treatment of the most recent productions in the field—by Case, Lake, J. Weiss, Loofs, Sanday, Bousset, Spitta, and others—which might in many cases have been expected to occasion controversy. It is a delight to find a frankly apologetic and dogmatic position set forth with equal learning and considerateness, *caritas et claritas*. It is good also to have the thoroughly conservative-orthodox position presented on such a large scale. It has become almost traditional for the subject of Christian Origins to be treated from the 'minimizing' viewpoint: as by Baur, Renan, Pfleiderer, and others. Whereas we might reasonably expect that a 'maximizing' view would bring forth out of these treasures things new as well as old. We might even go so far as to suppose that no one is in a position completely to understand and adequately to interpret the phenomena of primitive Christianity, who lacked sympathy with at least some of the aspects of that Catholicism toward which the religion of the New Testament period gradually but powerfully and irresistibly tended.

Dr. Nolloth's position is loyally Catholic and Anglican, and with no appearance of strain or tension in his loyalty.

He seems to have acquired that special grace of some of the greatest of our scholars—of whom Westcott is an example—by which doctrinal loyalty becomes more vital even than a 'second-nature', and is unconsciously inwoven with the very fabric of their thought. It is no external constraint, such as doctrinal loyalty so frequently appears to those who are never called upon to profess it; but is the very secret of virile and progressive Christian thinking. This is noteworthy in the most crucial instance of the working of this principle in the work before us: where, on p. 204, the author recognizes the inadequacy of the formula of Chalcedon. We are reminded of Dr. Sanday's position in *Christologies Ancient and Modern* (1910; p. 54). Progressive Christian thinking seems to demand the abandonment of that part of the Chalcedonian formula which emphasizes the distinction of the Two Natures at cost of the unity of our Lord's Personality (see Vol. I of this REVIEW, p. 96 *ff.*). If doctrinal loyalty were what it is often represented to be, progress in such a case would be impossible, and the ablest thinkers of the Church would long ago have abandoned her to the fate of everlasting mental desuetude. The frank recognition, by such a conservative as Dr. Nolloth, that such an inadequacy exists in the formula is itself a ground for confidence in the vitality of Catholic theology, and in its promise for the future.

The dates to which the documents of primitive Christianity are assigned indicate the author's conservatism. He shares fully in the reaction recently observable in certain English theological circles, and manifest in the works of Allen, Plummer, and others. Luke is dated 57/8; Acts 61/2; Matthew 54-57 (St. Matthew himself was author of both 'Q' and the gospel bearing his name); Mark 50 (with an Aramaic original earlier still); 'Q' in our Lord's lifetime; John (by the Apostle John) c. 95; II Peter, the one exception to the author's ultra-conservatism, c. 150. The Didache is placed well within the limits of the first century. It need hardly be said that consider-

able use is made of Zahn's *Einleitung*, and of B. Weiss' *Einleitung, Leben Jesu, and Biblische Theologie*.

The use made of the documents is generally uncritical and harmonistic: *e. g.*, in the treatment of the Nativity narratives (p. 152; *cf.* 175*f.*, where the Holy Family is sent on a special journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem to receive the visit of the Magi); in the solution of the difficulty presented by our Lord's commission to the disciples, 'raise the dead' (p. 322); and in the use made of the Fourth Gospel. It is not sufficiently recognized that a real development took place between the period of 'Q' and Mark and that of the Fourth Gospel. As a result of this appears the statement on p. 474, "the root idea of the Eucharist was only made known to the Church as the first century was closing." Similarly, we read once more that Seneca perused St. Paul's epistles (p. 105); that our Lord accepted the title *κύριος* (p. 111); that He foresaw and ordained the repetition of the Last Supper in the words, "Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God" (p. 484; 487); that Christianity's greatest contribution to religion is the Catholic doctrine of the Blessed Trinity (p. 297—at least an extreme statement, needing qualification); and that Matt. 28 : 19*f.* comes from the lost ending of St. Mark's gospel (p. 461*n*; 462*n*; 470*n*), and is therefore apostolic (Petrine). This last statement may be critically tenable, but is hardly of sufficient certitude to warrant its use in an argument for the unquestionable apostolicity of the great Matthean saying.

Complaint might be offered at the slight use made of Hellenistic religious history, and even of contemporary Jewish. Apocalyptic Judaism is given next to no place at all, and only slight reference is made to the mystery religions. Of course, we must not be led to expect treatments of these subjects in every work we pick up nowadays, simply because of their vogue in recent years. The limitations in our author's purpose are to be borne in mind. Nevertheless, a discriminating use of the Mishna, the Apocalypses, and other literature of late

Judaism would have been worth while in several of the chapters. It is almost inconceivable that anyone should attempt today to treat thoroughly of primitive Christianity without making large use of the contemporary, and even later, Jewish literature.

As in his earlier book (mentioned above), Dr. Nolloth has not made quite the use of first-hand sources which he has made of modern works. This is not an adverse criticism, for the method has its advantages, particularly in a propaedeutic and apologetic work, designed for readers (and there are plenty in this class!) who are more familiar with modern works than with ancient documents. For the persons who have kept our English and American presses humming these last two decades with translations of every German work on the New Testament that has appeared, no method is likely to be better suited than that of Dr. Nolloth—*viz.*, copious quotations in the footnotes, and vigorous discussions of 'liberal' and other positions in the text.

The chapters on 'the Preparation' contain good collections of material, as far as they go, especially the chapter on the Jewish Dispersion. And the author's defense of the Christian point of view in chapter VIII ('Miracles and History') is extremely good (for example, p. 134) and the use made of the Resurrection on p. 141 is on a very high level indeed.

It is in the account of our Lord's teaching that we experience the greatest dissatisfaction. It is inadequate in its brevity—we reach chapter XIX ('The Death of Christ') long before we are ready for it, and the hint on page 326 (the greater importance of Jesus' death) does not relieve the situation. It is said (p. 268) that "Christ's first appeal to men was for *faith in Himself*, as realizing in His own Person the Kingdom of God." This hardly squares with the Synoptic representation of our Lord's earliest preaching, "the Kingdom of God is at hand, repent," but is due to the Johannine representation. Again, the absence of a genuine historical point of view is to be seen on page 272, where it is argued that Our Lord could not have expected the immediate coming of the Kingdom, because He fore-

saw the development of human knowledge (the Renaissance, etc.), and would not cut it short!—and on page 273, where it is simply said that He came to found the Church, and therefore could not have expected the end of the age in His own generation!

Aside from this, the treatment of our Lord's knowledge is very good, *e. g.*, in treating of His 'originality' (p. 266):

If to be able to open out a whole vista of thought by the utterance of a single phrase, to stir the pulse of men of every race and nationality by a word, to touch the hearts of the hardest by a loving appeal, is not originality, it would be hard to find it elsewhere.

And compare the discussion of our Lord's 'want of universality', ending on page 265:

These considerations may help to counteract any reflection upon a want of universality in our Lord. Power owes more to intensity than to distribution. We see evidence of this in the character of St. Paul. He deliberately takes his line and will not be turned from it. It is the swift stream closely hemmed between its banks that drives the mill, not the quiet expansiveness of a still lagoon. Concentration is for man the prime requirement for effectiveness, and Jesus Christ was man.

The treatment of our Lord's death is very satisfactory. There is much in it to remind us of Moberly (*e. g.*, p. 331).

In the treatment of the Resurrection narratives, we find presented that solution which is the only one possible, except the denial of one or other set of narratives, those of Galilee or those of Jerusalem. This is the hypothesis that the disciples returned to Galilee during the forty days preceding the Ascension, and then came back to the capital for the final appearances and departure of our Lord. Only, the motive of the return to Jerusalem, *i. e.*, the appropriateness of the Ascension taking place in the vicinity of the Crucifixion, seems artificial, and not so probable as that proposed by E. F. Scott in *The Beginnings of the Church* (1914; p. 20 *ff.*), *viz.*, that the disciples returned to Jerusalem, convinced of our Lord's Resurrec-

tion, and in the expectation (supported by Mal. 3:1), of His immediate Parousia in the temple.

Chapter XXVI offers a splendid treatment of St. Paul, with sound criticism of the theory which makes him the virtual founder of Christianity, and a vigorous discussion of the character of St. Paul's experience at his conversion. It must be admitted that the author's use of psychology here in defense of the physically real and objectively miraculous character of the epiphany of our Lord to Saul is hardly more successful than the more frequent use which is made of it to explain the phenomenon as subjective and 'visionary'. The whole area of visionary phenomena needs considerable more investigation before authoritative pronouncements are in order, and before the principles of psychology can be confidently applied to such historical events as Paul's conversion and its accompanying experience.

The account of the beginnings of the New Testament Canon (p. 405*ff.*; 454*ff.*) is extremely commendable; as is also that of the apostolic ministry (440-453). Enough has already been said to suggest the treatment given in the chapters on New Testament doctrine (St. Peter, Paul and John). The chapter on the Sacraments is, of course, thoroughly doctrinal. Controversialists will be interested in the statement on p. 490 that in the Church of Rome, the Eucharist is no longer a Sacrament. "Its representative, symbolical character is gone. A miracle has taken place to which our Lord's action here on earth offers no parallel. The effect of such a conception on the Sacrament is like that of the Docetic view of the Incarnation upon the doctrine of the Person of Christ. To secure the Deity, the reality of the Manhood was sacrificed with disastrous results. In the same way, the sacramental value of the Eucharist is marred by the effort to obtain a literal fulfilment of Christ's words." The whole chapter will repay careful study.

Despite its extreme conservatism, here is a book which may be recommended to 'the busy pastor', who wishes to know

present-day positions at second hand, and with the sting removed; and who is looking for a book filled with suggestive ideas for the homiletical treatment of the New Testament. It is also a book for the apologist, though we could wish—as we especially and always do wish in apologetics—that the tools were newer and less old-fashioned. But the New Testament student will find here little that is new. Not that his search is that of the philosophers in Athens (Acts 17:21): rather, he already has in his possession the materials of which the present book makes use.

The book contains some exquisite passages of devotional value (*cf.* pp. 143; 169 *ff.*), as well as passages suggestive for homiletics (265 *ff.*; 311 *ff.*; etc.). The author has studied St. Augustine's sermons, as his references show. Occasionally we meet with that charmingly archaic style which is reminiscent of the sermons of Isaac Williams. But the following is more characteristic of the work as a whole (p. 402):

Our Lord . . . lays down the necessity of His own withdrawal. His visible, bodily presence, under the limitations imposed upon Him by taking our flesh and blood, is an obstacle to that diffuse, extended presence which is effected by the Holy Spirit. He must depart that He may be more truly with us: for His departure was not the passing to a remote, inaccessible heaven, but the entrance into the world of spirit. He so went that He remained; unseen, yet more truly present.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

Aram and Israel or The Aramaeans in Syria and Mesopotamia. By EMIL G. H. KREALING. Columbia University Press, New York, 1918, pp. xvi + 154. \$1.50 net.

Dr. Krealing has produced a very able and scholarly book on the rôle played by the Aramaeans in the world's history. There is nothing very original here, but the author has gathered every scintilla of evidence available from many various sources. He begins his work with a discussion of his sources and a geographical picture of the home of the Aramaeans. He then takes up the origin of these peoples, showing their early relations with

the Hittites and the Babylonians, and that they were a larger whole of which the Sute, and Terah of the Old Testament, were parts. Their home was perhaps in Chaldea—a view held by Amos 9:7. Early in their history they moved westward, overrunning the Hittites, going as far as Carchemish and Syria, and by the thirteenth century all Mesopotamia was overrun by them. The origin of the name is not clear.

The author then proceeds to trace their history step by step in western Mesopotamia, showing first the nature of their civilization, and then their international relationships. At an early date they came into contact with Palestine, the inhabitants of which were a related people—Jacob was called a 'roving Aramaean' (Deut. 26:5)—though their intense intermingling soon colored their Aramaean character. Wars between Syria and Israel were common from the time of David onward. The history of the early kings of Damascus makes interesting reading for students of the Old Testament, who see from a different angle the events that transpired in the times of Rezon and Solomon, Benhadad and Asa, and Benhadad III and Ahab. The following chapters go into the details of politics and war in the Mesopotamian kingdoms and the North Syrian states and lead up to the supremacy of Damascus and her wars with Israel under Joash and Jeroboam II; they pass in review the new page of history written by the excavators of Sençirli; they show how the cuneiform inscriptions of the Vannic kings bear their testimony; and lead us to the fall of Damascus in 732 when Rezin was defeated by Tiglathpileser. Aramaea still continued, but never again the great military power that she was. Rather, her sons became the carriers of merchandise, and in spite of repeated persecutions, provoked by frequent revolt from the Assyrian overlord, she forced her language (Aramaic) upon her conquerors and upon the rest of the world from "the Persian gulf to Cilicia, and from Edessa to Petra and to Syene or the Nile;" and "it maintained its supremacy even against the inroads of Hellenistic civilization until finally the great onset of Islam brought its rule to a sudden end."

With the book is printed an *errata* to which the following may be added: page 3, line 14, *read* note 9; page 91, line 35, *read* Babylonian; page 107, line 26 *read* Mati-ili, and lines 27 and 34, *read* ram for goat. One 'Buhl' should be omitted on page 24. On many points issue may be taken, but this must necessarily be so in a field where there remains so much investigation yet to be accomplished.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

A History of the Christian Church. By WILLISTON WALKER. Scribner's, New York, 1918, pp. xiv + 624. \$3.00 net.

Professor Walker has presented to English reading students a very serviceable one-volume history of the Church. There has long been a demand for just such a work, and the Yale professor has produced an outline history, comparable to those of Knoepfler, Deutsch, Funk, and Fisher, which can be used with decided profit by those wishing an outline of Church History more detailed than that furnished by even elaborate Tables, and yet limited to the space of one volume.

Dr. Walker states that he is indebted to Loofs and Krueger, and as a whole the emphasis of the work seems to be that of 'Liberal Orthodoxy', with a heart tendency toward Orthodoxy. Both Nicean and Chalcedonian definitions, for instance, are upheld and justified, but with apologies. The treatment of the Early Period seems to the present reviewer much better than that of either the Mediaeval or Reformation Periods. Up to Gregory the Great, the treatment is an admirable following of the conventionally classic outline. Thence onward, there is a decided lack of clarity in presentation. For instance, by keeping St. Gregory in the Early, rather than in the Middle Ages, the latter appear hazily and almost by chance, without any constructive creation of the Mediaeval situation as the stage for the drama of the Holy Roman Empire and of the Church.

Even more unfortunate is Dr. Walker's starting of the Reformation with Luther in 1517. After the Hergenroether-Kirsch treatment, this seems a distinct relapse in historical per-

spective. In Dr. Walker's presentation, the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries cannot but seem ages of decline, rather than of progress, with the result that the Lutheran Revolt, instead of coming as the wellnigh inevitable climax of an historical development (Avignon Captivity, Great Schism, Poverty Movement, Reform Councils, and Renaissance) appears practically unheralded, with Luther alone as *deus ex machina*. Creighton's failure at this very point, with Acton's strictures, ought to have acted as a danger signal to all later historians. Either Luther must have been about the greatest personal genius in religion, ecclesiasticism, and economics, with whom history is acquainted, or else he was hardly more than the spark which set off that gunpowder of discontent which had been accumulating through the years. In view of recent investigation and of our present control of the sources, Luther was obviously *not* such a giant personality (*vide* Boehmer, Troeltsch, and Grisar, among many). Therefore, we are being forced to elucidate those forces of which Luther was but an expression, and then to arrange our historical periods so as to manifest this connection. In short, Luther as the closely linked product of forces at work in Europe from around 1300 is quite understandable, by the ordinary canons of historical criticism. Luther as the unheralded genius of the early Sixteenth Century presents for history an unsolved, if not insolvable, problem.

Nevertheless, despite our inability to follow Dr. Walker in methodology, we heartily welcome his book as the best one-volume outline history of the Church in English today, and we thank him for giving it to us.

LEICESTER C. LEWIS

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Joseph Halévy, distinguished orientalist and Old Testament scholar, died at Paris, January 21, 1917.

Sir Edward Burnett Tylor, famous author of *Primitive Culture*, died January 2, 1917.

Rev. Charles Wagner died at Paris on May 13, 1918, at the age of sixty-seven. He is best known through his book, *The Simple Life*.

The Russian mystic, Vladimir Soloviv, recently died. His death has cut short a life which was devoted to a union of the Roman and Eastern Churches. His philosophical writings are numerous.

The Greek Church has just acquired a new metropolitan in Athens, Archbishop Meletios Metaxakis, a reformer, patron of autonomy for his Church, and a staunch supporter of higher education for his clergy.

Rev. James Jackson, D.D., late president of Boone University, Wuchang, died in April, 1918. Dr. Jackson had lived in China forty-two years, and from 1901 was connected with Boone. Under him the small college became the flourishing university. Dr. Jackson was a thorough Chinese scholar, and had written commentaries on both the Pentateuch and the Pauline Epistles, in Chinese.

Dr. Arthur C. Headlam, well-known as theological writer and editor of *The Church Quarterly Review*, succeeds Dr. Henry Scott Holland, as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford.

Dr. J. P. Whitney has resigned the professorship of Ecclesiastical History at King's College, London. He is the author of the justly popular volume on *The Reformation* in the Church Universal Series.

Dr. Walter Rauschenbush, probably the foremost interpreter in America of Christianity in modern social terms, died in July, 1918. Born only fifty-seven years ago, he was graduated from the Rochester Theological Seminary in 1886. After several years of missionary work he became head of the department of Church History at his Alma Mater in 1902. From that chair he issued those writings which have meant so much to social thinkers in this country. Notable were his *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, *Christianizing the Social Order*, and *A Theology for the Social Gospel* (*Vide* review of this last, ATR, I, 1).

Mr. Edmund Bishop, the co-worker with Cardinal Gasquet on *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, died last Spring. A collection of his essays, mainly liturgical and historical, has been published by the Clarendon Press, Oxford, under the title *Liturgica Historica*.

Students of mediaeval and ecclesiastical history will regret the retirement of Dr. Ephraim Emerton, from the Winn professorship of ecclesiastical history at Harvard. Dr. Emerton had been Winn professor since 1882, and had produced a number of works of real value to both students and scholars.

Among them may be mentioned *Introduction to the Study of the Middle Ages*, *Mediaeval Europe*, *Unitarian Thought*, and *The Beginnings of Modern Europe*. Professor Emerton is succeeded by Dr. Kirsopp Lake, who has also been at Harvard as Professor of Early Christian Literature, since 1914.

It is really too bad that the Fathers of Nicea did not have modern mathematics with which to answer the logical saws of Arius. The *Thalia* would not be in it with the properties of the Infinite, as portrayed, for instance, by Dedekind, *Essays on the Theory of Numbers*, Beman's translation, p. 41. The problem as to the relation of the Son to the Father, as defined in the Athanasian Creed, turns out to be in simple and obvious harmony with these recent mathematical elucidations of the nature of the Infinite. Dedekind says: "A system S is said to be *infinite* when it is similar to a proper part of itself." That is, two systems, assumed or known to be infinite, may be similar or one-to-one correspondent, even if one is only a part of the other, and infinity *consists in* just such similarity.

Not only for the Christology, but for the Trinity as a whole are there interesting analogies. Professor C. Keyser in *The New Infinite and the Old Theology* points this out, pp. 85 ff., in the relation of the even numbers E, the odd numbers O, and the rational fractions F, to the manifold of all the rational numbers M. "We have here three infinite manifolds, E, O, F, no two of which have so much as a single element in common, and yet the three together constitute one manifold M, exactly equal in wealth of elements to each of its infinite components."

Hence if there be today any Cartesianly-minded theologians, let them take notice.

British Tommies became enthusiastic about St. George, when on August 23, 1917, they discovered the remains of an ancient church at Shellal, between Beersheba and Khan

Yunus. A splendid mosaic pavement, of about 8,000 pieces, was discovered intact, and an inscription stated: "This temple . . . was built by our most holy . . . and most pious George in the year 622."

Students of Mithraism and Christianity will be interested in knowing about a new Mithraic relief from Syria of the first century B. C. recently made public in the *Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria*, Div. II. *Ancient Architecture in Syria*, Pt. 6, Leyden: Brill, 1916. It is a relief of Mithra slaying the bull. The usual accompaniments are present, the dog, the serpent, and the scorpion; but there are other figures besides.

An interesting series of articles, by Gustavus A. Eisen, fully illustrated, on the great chalice of Antioch, discovered in 1910, which contains the earliest (first century, A. D.) portrait of Christ and the Apostles, may be read in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vols. 20, 426-437; 21, 77-79, 80-81, 169-186.

A newly discovered Syriac document, now in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, just edited, with two others, by Dr. Alphonse Mingana (Longmans, Green, & Co., New York), is a "fragment from the philosopher Andronicus, and Asaph, the historian of the Jews," and treats of the Greek and Hebrew names of the zodiacal signs. St. Paul's interesting term *στοιχεῖα* is found in the manuscript. One of the other documents belongs to the pseudepigrapha ascribed to Shem, the son of Noah.

